

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 2nd February 1923, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[*Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order. No. 15—*

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner :—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Pay of attenders in the Revenue department.

760 Q.—MR. A. M. AHMAD MIRAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(1) whether it is a fact that attenders in the Revenue departments in mufassal are paid Rs. 12, while attenders with the same qualifications in other departments are paid Rs. 20 and upwards;

(2) if the answer is in the affirmative what is the reason for this difference; and

(3) whether the Government have on hand any proposal to increase the pay of the Revenue attenders to the level of that in other departments?

A.—(1) & (2) Attenders in the Revenue department in the mufassal have been placed in the scale Rs. 12—18. The work which these persons do could and should be done mainly by peons. In other departments a higher rate of pay has been fixed with reference to the nature of the work with which they have been entrusted.

(3) No.

Inspectors of co-operative societies in Ernad and Walavanad.

761 Q.—MR. A. D. M. BAVOTTI SAHIB: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) the number of inspectors of co-operative societies in the Ernad and Walavanad taluks of Malabar;

(b) how many of them are Muhammadans; and

(c) whether the Government think that the present number of inspectors is sufficient for the two taluks?

A.—The information has been called for.

Water-supply in Salem town.

762 Q.—RAO SAHIB S. ELLAPPA CHETTIYAR: With reference to question No. 422 and the answer thereto, dated the 1st September 1921, regarding water-supply to private houses in Salem, will the hon. the Minister for Local

[2nd February 1923]

Self-Government be pleased to state whether orders have been passed on the resolution of the Salem municipality, No. R.O.C. 137 G.C. of 1922, dated the 25th December 1921, and the subsequent reminders sent on the 8th May 1922, 13th July 1922 and 13th September 1922 regarding water-supply to private houses in Salem?

A.—The issue of final orders on the letter of the Chairman, Municipal Council, Salem, No. 137 G.C., dated 25th December 1921, regarding water-works by-laws, has been deferred pending the framing of the model by-laws on the subject which the Government had then under consideration. The model by-laws on this and other subjects have since been drafted and will shortly be published for the guidance of all local bodies in framing their own regulations.

The further communications from the Chairman, referred to by the hon. Member, have been received and replied to.

Building grant to Salem College.

763 Q.—Rao Sahib S. ELLAPPA CHETTIYAR: With reference to question No. 423 and the reply thereto, dated the 1st September 1921, regarding a building grant to Salem College, will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) what action has been taken on the plans and estimates submitted to the Government by the Salem municipality under their letter No. R.O.C. 10 G.C. of 13th May 1922; and

(b) whether there is any likelihood of giving the promised grant for the building at an early date as the want of accommodation is very much felt?

A.—In 1913 the Government undertook to construct from Provincial funds a new building for the Salem College, and plans and estimates for the building were prepared by the Public Works Department. Owing to the present financial stringency the scheme, which is estimated to cost over two lakhs, cannot be proceeded with.

Assignment of land to Arundhateyas.

764 Q.—Mr. L. C. GURUSWAMI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased—

(a) to state whether any poramboke lands set apart for assignment to the depressed classes have been assigned to the members of the Arundhateya (Madiga) community in the various districts of the Presidency since 1921; and

(b) if so, to lay on the table a statement showing the number of Arundhateyas who were benefited by these assignments and the extent of land assigned in each district?

A.—No separate information is available for the extent of land granted to any particular section of the depressed classes.

Adi-Dravida member on the South Arcot District Board and Cuddalore Taluk Board.

765 Q.—Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA: With reference to the answer given by the Government to question No. 664, at the meeting of the Council on

2nd February 1923]

22nd December 1922, regarding communal representation in the South Arcot Taluk Board, will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) whether the Adi-Dravida member, referred to in the *Report* forming an appendix to the answer, was not on the District Board when he was a member of the Cuddalore Taluk Board;

(2) whether he was not a member both on the South Arcot District Board and on the Cuddalore Taluk Board then;

(3) when he was first nominated to the District Board of South Arcot;

(4) when he was first nominated to the Taluk Board of Cuddalore; and

(5) when his place was filled in by another; and who was appointed in his place and why was he preferred?

A.—The Government have no information.

Admission of Adi-Dravidas into Chidambaram taluk board office.

766 Q.—Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) if as in the *Report* appended to the answer given to question No. 664 at the meeting of the Council on 22nd December 1922 “an Adi-Dravida could not be appointed to the Chidambaram Taluk Board as the owner of the rented house in which the Taluk Board office is located had objected to the Adi-Dravida entering the premises”, how it was that during the last taluk board elections Adi-Dravida voters were allowed to enter the building and register their votes;

(2) when this building was rented for the purpose of locating the Taluk Board office;

(3) whether this was a condition on which the rental agreement was registered; if so, whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table a copy of the first registered rental agreement giving the date of the registration, etc.;

(4) if Adi-Dravidas are not allowed into this office building, then how the Adi-Dravida tax-payer is expected to make his payments there;

(5) how many Adi-Dravidas are registered as voters in the electoral roll of the Chidambaram Taluk Board; and

(6) the names of Adi-Dravidas, who applied for nomination to the Chidambaram Taluk Board?

A.—The Government have no information.

Adi-Dravidas in Tiruvannamalai municipal council.

767 Q.—Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) whether it is a fact that one Mr. Ramaswami Pillai, an Adi-Dravida, was nominated to the Tiruvannamalai Municipal Council;

(2) whether it is a fact that the said Mr. Ramaswami Pillai died; if so, whether an Adi-Dravida has been nominated to that place; if not, why; and who was nominated to that place and from what community;

(3) the number of Adi-Dravidas registered as voters in the electoral roll of the Tiruvannamalai Municipal Council; and

[2nd February 1923]

(4) whether the Government have received representations from the Adi-Dravidas of Tiruvannamalai that the vacant seat, caused by the death of Mr. Ramaswami Pillai, should be filled by an Adi-Dravida; if so, what steps the Government have taken in that direction?

A.—(1) The answer is in the affirmative.

(2) M.R.Ry. P. S. Pachayappa Chettiyar Avargal was nominated in the vacancy caused by the death of M.R.Ry. V. Ramaswami Pillai Avargal as no suitable Adi-Dravida was then available for nomination in the vacancy.

(3) The Government have no information.

(4) The Government did not receive any such representations for the vacancy referred to—a representation was received some time later.

Extra officers in the Secretariat.

768 Q.—The RAJA OF RAMNAD: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(1) the number of extra officers employed in the Secretariat after 1st April 1922 with the special nature of their work and pay and

(2) the names of officers who are as a special case allowed to draw higher pay than they would draw according to the time scale with reasons for such treatment?

A.—The information asked for is furnished in the statement appended.*

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"May I ask the hon. the Finance Member for some particulars with reference to the answers given? I wish to know whether the special pay of Rs. 200 given to Mr. B. Rama Rao is for his appointment as Deputy Secretary or whether it represents the same amount he would be drawing in the time-scale."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"The special pay is for the appointment as Deputy Secretary."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"With reference to the special pay allowed to Mr. Strathie for the preparation of a pamphlet on the Excise Administration in Madras, I wish to know whether he was during this period preparing this Excise Administration report attending at the same time to his normal work. If not, I wish to know what special reason there was for the increase allowed in the pay."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Mr. Strathie was placed on special duty which involved touring to other provinces and also change of headquarters for a considerable part of the period, and he was given special pay equal to what used to be the deputation allowance of ten rupees a day."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"Again, Sir, I find a special officer appointed for the preparation of the Madras Presidency Administration Reports. I wish to know whether it was usual to allow special pay for the preparation of the Administration Reports and whether the same was done in previous years."

2nd February 1923]

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" It used to be the practice to employ a special officer. Of late, for the last year or two we have endeavoured to save money by having the work done in the office. But that arrangement was not successful and we reverted to the previous practice."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" Sir, referring to the cases of Mr. Tottenham and Mr. R. V. Krishna Ayyar, I wish to know whether such increments to protect people from pecuniary loss when they are transferred from the mufassal to the Secretariat have been given in all cases of such transfers."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" It certainly would not be fair on the part of Government to bring officers on account of their special abilities into the Secretariat and cause them to lose money in consequence."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" My question is not answered. I wanted to know whether the practice was followed in all cases of transfers to the Secretariat from the mufassal."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" The answer is that it is not the case always. But when the Secretariat posts are so paid that it would involve a loss to officers to come to them from the mufassal, we generally make good the loss."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" Sir, may I know what pay Mr. Gopala-krishna Ayyar was drawing when he was given Rs. 750."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" As stated in the answer, Rs. 750 was the pay drawn by him while holding the temporary post of Assistant Secretary, Finance Department."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" The grade is 500—50—800. The justification for giving him Rs. 750 is that he was drawing this pay when he acted temporarily as Assistant Secretary before. I want to know what amount he was drawing in the grade when he was given Rs. 750."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" So far as I recollect, Sir, he was holding the post of a Deputy Collector with an allowance. When this post was created on the scale Rs. 500—50—800, he was given a pay which was equivalent to his permanent pay as Deputy Collector plus the allowance he was drawing."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" So he was given the pay plus the allowance plus something more so as to make up the figure Rs. 750."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" No, Sir. He was given the pay plus the allowance."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I should ask the Finance Member to inform the Council as to whether any and what progress in the Finance Committee has been made in regard to the giving of these special allowances. Because it seems to me if this is the evidence of retrenchment by Government, the methods of retrenchment are somewhat peculiar, I should say. I should, therefore, like to know whether on this general question which was under consideration, any decision had been reached. I find all the allowances repeated in these cases. I wish to have the information from the Finance Member."

[2nd February 1923]

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ An exhaustive enquiry has been made, Sir, and the Retrenchment Committee have formulated their general conclusions. I hoped that we should have been able to present the final conclusions before this time, but owing to the fact that, with a view to retrenchment, we are employing the same officer as Retrenchment Secretary and as one of our representatives in the Imperial Assembly, it has not been possible to push through the work. I am hoping that he may be able to come down between the sittings of the Assembly to give us the benefit of his further conclusions which he is still working at in Delhi.”

Government assistance to repatriated Indians.

769 Q.—SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether during the current official year the Government have received any communication from the Government of India regarding the assistance to be afforded by them to the Colony-returned Indians;

(b) if so, what steps the Government have taken to provide facilities for the resettlement in this province of repatriated Indians; and

(c) what the number is of such repatriated Indians for whom they have procured employment during the current official year and what the proportion is of men thus provided to those who are still in need of employment?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Commissioner of Labour is entrusted with the duty of attempting to provide repatriated Indians with employment wherever necessary. No other steps on the part of Government have been found necessary.

(c) The Government have no information as to the exact number of persons for whom employment has been procured during the current official year but no cases of repatriated Indians who are in need of employment have come to their notice.

Revision of the scheme of Government technical examinations.

770 Q.—SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state if and when the Committee appointed to revise the scheme of the Government Technical Examination has submitted its report?

A.—The report was submitted to Government in November last.

Ceded districts representation in the various departments.

771 Q.—MR. K. SARABHA REDDI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue, the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to lay on the table statistics as they stood on 31st March 1922 for the Ceded districts under the following heads :—

(1) the total number of vacancies on Rs. 50 and above in the Revenue, Judicial, Educational and Police departments;

(2) the number of such vacancies filled up (a) by bona fide natives of the Ceded districts and (b) by others not coming under (a);

2nd February 1923]

(3) the number of men from the Ceded districts in Government service outside the Ceded districts in this Presidency; and

(4) the reasons for the dearth of natives of the Ceded districts in the several posts?

A.—The Government have no information.

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—“ With reference to the answer to question No. 771, I rise to ask whether the Government will be pleased to call for the information.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ I am afraid I cannot accept the suggestion.”

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—“ Sir, I wish an answer from the other Member of Government.”

The hon. Sir K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ The other Member says ditto.”

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—“ Then, Sir, are the Government incapable of giving any reply?”

Christian representation in the Sivaganga estate establishments.

772 Q.—Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state the number of Christian officers and clerks employed in the Sivaganga estate after the advent of the present Estate Collector?

A.—The Government have no information.

Employment of natives of Ceded districts in the Education Department.

773 Q.—Mr. P. SIVA RAO : Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that no native of the Ceded districts has been taken from the Sub-Assistants cadre into the Madras Provincial Educational Service within the last two years, and that outsiders have been freely imported into the said districts; and

(b) what are the reasons for this supersession?

A.—(a) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative. As to the second part, two Telugu officers were appointed as Assistant Inspectors in the Ceded districts in the Madras Educational Service which is a Provincial cadre.

(b) There was no supersession.

APPENDIX A.

[Vide answer to question No. 768 asked by the Raja of Ramnad at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd February 1923, page 1562 supra.]

List of extra officers employed in the Secretariat after 1st April 1922, with the special nature of their work and pay.

Name of officer.	Posts held and pay.	Special nature of the work on which employed.
(a) Mr. B. Rama Rao, L.C.S.	Deputy Secretary, Local Self-Government Department (temporary). Pay according to superior time-scale plus special pay of Rs. 200.	To cope with the increase of work in the Local Self-Government Secretariat.

[2nd February 1923]

List of extra officers employed in the Secretariat after 1st April 1922, with the special nature of their work and pay—cont.

Name of officer.	Posts held and pay.	Special nature of the work on which employed.
(b) M.R.Ry. T. B. Ramachandra Mudaliyar Avargal, B.A.	Assistant Secretary, Local Self-Government Department (temporary) from 12th October 1922 to 2nd January 1923. Pay Rs. 500. The post of Under Secretary in the Local Self-Government Department was held in abeyance during the period this appointment lasted.	To cope with the increase of work in the Local Self-Government Secretariat.
(c) Mr. D. N. Strathie, I.C.S.	Special officer (temporary). Pay according to superior time-scale <i>plus</i> Rs. 300 special pay.	Preparation of a pamphlet regarding Exoise Administration in Madras.
(d) Mr. A. R. MacEwen, I.C.S.	Special officer (temporary). Pay Rs. 750.	Preparation of the Madras Presidency Administration Report for 1921-22.
(e) Mr. R. W. Davies, I.C.S.	Retrenchment Secretary (temporary). Pay according to the superior time-scale <i>plus</i> special pay of Rs. 250 per mensem.	To attend to work connected with retrenchment in expenditure and to help the Retrenchment Committee, in addition to their duties as members of the Legislative Assembly.
(f) Mr. T. E. Moir, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S.	Retrenchment Secretary (temporary). Pay according to the superior time-scale <i>plus</i> special pay of Rs. 250 per mensem.	
(g) Mr. H. A. Watson, I.C.S.	Deputy Secretary, Finance (temporary). Pay according to the superior time-scale <i>plus</i> special pay of Rs. 200 per mensem.	To cope with the special increase of work during the budget season in the Finance Secretariat.

List of officers who have been allowed to draw higher pay than they would draw according to the time-scale.

Name of officer.	Post held and pay.	Reason for granting a special rate of pay.
Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham, I.C.S.	Under Secretary, Chief Secretariat. Pay in the inferior time-scale <i>plus</i> special pay of Rs. 200 <i>plus</i> Rs. 100 personal allowance.	To protect him from pecuniary loss by transfer from the mufussal to the Secretariat.
M.R.Ry. R. V. Krishna Ayyar Avargal, B.A., M.L.	Assistant Secretary, Law Department. Pay Rs. 800.	Was granted two increments in advance in the scale of Rs. 500—50—800 for the reason that living in the city is costlier and that the new appointment of Assistant Secretary, Law Department, involved increased responsibility.
M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib V. Gopalakrishna Ayyar Avargal, B.A.	Assistant Secretary, Finance Department. Pay Rs. 750.	Permitted to draw Rs. 750 in the scale Rs. 500—50—800, Rs. 750 representing the salary previously drawn by him while holding the temporary post of Assistant Secretary, Finance Department, which was made permanent with effect from 11th May 1922.

2nd February 1923]

II

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

(1)

With reference to the answer given to the question supplemental to question No. 294 asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 16th September 1922, the SECRETARY laid on the table a *statement showing the commission drawn by the Official Assignee of Madras in each of the years 1918—1921 and the commission paid to Messrs. Dowden & Co., the auctioneers of the Official Assignee, during those years.

(2)

The SECRETARY also laid on the table † G.O. No. 63-A, Finance, dated 18th January 1923, regarding the nomination of Mr. C. E. Wood as a member of the Standing Finance Committee.

III

DEMAND FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1922-23.

Grant XXXII.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" Sir, I beg to move—

That the Government be granted an additional allotment of Rs. 10,00,000 under 47. Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous and unforeseen charges—on account of compensation to be made for losses sustained during the recent Mappilla rebellion in Malabar.

"Mr. President, I feel it particularly unfortunate that after the warning given yesterday on the subject of supplementary grants in general it falls to me to stand before the House and move a supplementary grant for 10 lakhs of rupees. I am quite confident, however, that the House will feel that this particular case is not an illustration of the perpetual extravagance of the department which I have the honour to administer, and will view the demand with favour. The 10 lakhs are required for compensation for losses sustained by private persons in Malabar during the rebellion. The word 'compensation' is not perhaps strictly correct. We have been advised from the very outset that the Government were not under any legal obligation to give compensation. We published our decision to that effect and it has never been seriously questioned. At the same time, the Government did recognize that whatever could be done for those unfortunate sufferers in Malabar should be done, and they decided that as an act of grace the fines and confiscations levied on persons convicted in connexion with the rebellion should be set aside to be distributed among the sufferers.

"The details of the demand which I make fall into two sections. In the first place, we have already collected in the shape of fines a sum of about 2 lakhs of rupees. That money has gone into the head 'Judicial'. What I am now asking the Council to do is to transfer the money so as to let me have it, in pursuance of the promise already made by Government, for the purpose of distributing it among those who have suffered loss of property. That, Sir, accounts for 2 lakhs out of 10.

* Vide Appendix B at page 1634 infra.

† Vide Appendix C at page 1635 infra.

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

"The position of the remaining 8 lakhs is this. We have imposed already fines which amount to 9 lakhs over and above the 2 lakhs already collected.

"In accordance with the policy introduced last April and in pursuance of our desire not to send to jail a single man whom it was not necessary to imprison, we initiated the system under which those who were not charged with the most serious offences had their sentences of imprisonment suspended and were left to pay the fines imposed on them in instalments of two years. The result is that of these 9 lakhs of rupees a small portion only is being received every month and it will take us two years to collect the whole. Now, Sir, in regard to this what I ask the Council to do is to anticipate that receipt and let us have now the sum of Rs. 8,00,000 for distribution among the sufferers. It is most desirable that we should finish off this business as soon as possible. It would not do to hand over the Rs. 2,00,000 already collected to some of the sufferers and tell the others that they must wait until the rest of the money is collected. I hope therefore that the Council will be pleased to grant for this purpose the sum of Rs. 8 lakhs in anticipation of its subsequent recovery as I have explained; about the recovery I have no doubt whatever. The fines are of very small amounts, the majority of them not exceeding Rs. 50. I do not think that the Council need have any doubt as to their recovery.

"I quite realize that I may be asked the question how I arrive at the sum of Rs. 10,00,000 which I propose to give as compensation. To some extent it represents only an approximation; but we have as a basis the amount already issued in loans for the purpose of reconstructing damaged houses and for enabling the sufferers who lost their property to carry on until the next harvest. The House will perhaps remember that a sum of Rs. 10,00,000 for this purpose has been included in the current year's budget. When martial law was withdrawn and the troops left, and we wanted to begin the process of reconstruction, the conclusion came to was that the quickest and at the same time most cautious way of doing it would be not to make grants of money, but to start with the grant of loans, some of these loans being free of interest for one year. The amount which has been so utilized for giving loans is very nearly Rs. 9,00,000. But there are persons who for one reason or another did not ask for the loans, some who did not actually want money to carry on their agricultural or other operations, and some others who did not exactly come under the category of agriculturists, etc., who were entitled to the grant of loans. Lastly, in the case of Hindu temples, applications for loans have been received and they represent a case which I think we should, in fairness, take up if we can. It is for the purpose of writing off about Rs. 9,00,000 of these loans and of providing a further two lakhs for persons who did not apply for loans, that I now ask for the grant of Rs. 10,00,000 on the whole.

"Then, Sir, I may also be asked why it is that I cannot wait until next year, and why I should ask for this amount now as a supplementary grant. Well, the answer to that question is connected with this system of loans. As I said, these loans were mostly issued free of interest for one year. In some cases that period is fast approaching completion, and I know that there is a certain amount of apprehension in the minds of some people who have taken

2nd February 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

Grant XXXII—cont.

loans as to what the attitude of the Government is going to be in regard to the further extension of the period. Some people, I understand, have been kind enough to tell them that the Government want to take the whole loan back and insist upon its pound of flesh. That is not a fact. But I should like to allay that apprehension, and it seems to me the best way to do it is to declare at once that we are practically wiping out these loans. I have consulted every one who could give me advice on the subject and they all agree that as regards these thousands of people who suffered damage and who received loans, the most satisfactory way of relieving them now is to wipe out the loans. It is for that reason that I did not want to wait till next year, that is the time of the budget, before bringing the matter before the Council. At the time the budget will be passed, the period of one year for which the loans run free of interest will have expired in the case of a large number of people.

“So far as the financial aspect of this matter is concerned, the House will observe that all I am asking for as regards Rs. 8,00,000 of this grant is really to transfer it from loans and put it under grant, that grant being recouped by receipts from fines which will ultimately appear in another part of the budget. I may tell the House that Mr. MacMichael who is dealing with matters connected with Malabar generally has been permitted to appoint a committee to advise him as to the distribution of the money which the Council may grant among those who may not have happened to take loans. It is impossible formally to constitute that committee until some money is given to be distributed. But if the Council passes this demand to-day, I understand that the committee will be ready at once to make proposals. They have paid particular attention to a matter to which I have referred, that is, the distribution of some kind of compensation for the restoration of the very numerous Hindu temples which have been damaged. I think hon. Members of this House will feel that those temples should receive consideration. I am afraid, Sir, the matter is a little complicated. I have done my best to make it clear. But if any hon. Member desires further information, I shall be very happy to supply it.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“May I ask, Sir, whether any portion of this money will go to the local boards of Malabar?”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, I am sorry I have to oppose this grant. The hon. the Home Member was telling us what the position was. He told us that Rs. 11,00,000 were expected in the way of fines from those who were convicted in Malabar, of which amount Rs. 2,00,000 have been collected up to date, and that the collection of the balance of Rs. 9,00,000 is to be anticipated now and utilized for the purpose of giving compensation. He said that this compensation is to be given not by grants of money at once but by writing off Rs. 9,00,000 which have been advanced already. Well, Sir, it is rather difficult for me to see the urgency of the case. The money has been advanced already in the shape of loans to those who were suffering, and those people tided over their difficulties and now probably they have got a prosperous year. I do not see the urgency of anticipating the collection of such a large amount as Rs. 9,00,000 in the shape of fines; and it has also been said that the fines are to be collected in dribblets. I do not know if it can be seriously contended in a case like this when Rs. 9,00,000 are to

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

be collected in dribblets, that the whole amount can be collected. I think it is a very serious speculation. It was also said that many of these loans were going to mature this year and that we should have to tell the people whether we are going to collect them or not. I think there is an easy way of meeting the difficulty. The people may be told that the Government are not going to collect the money this year. Whether the loan itself is going to be written off or not may be decided when we collect the remaining Rs. 9,00,000. We are going to make these recoveries from the fines, and when the money is on hand, we can tell the people that we are writing off the whole amount, and until we can so write off the whole, we can tell them 'You can wait and see.' That is a position which will not in any way seriously interfere with the convenience of those who have received loans. Nothing need be collected from them this year and they may be told that nothing will be collected next year.

"Then the hon. the Home Member said that at his instance a committee was constituted in Malabar to decide what ought to be given to the people. That appears to me, Sir, a very strange proceeding. The Council has not yet decided what amount it is prepared to give, and it is only after that that a committee can be appointed to go into the matter of distribution. Instead of doing so, the hon. Member appoints a committee and says that the committee is waiting to know our decision and as soon as it receives that decision it will distribute the money. If the distribution is to depend on the vote of this Council, I think the committee will have to follow the decision of the Council and not to precede it. So, it seems to me a strange procedure to appoint this committee in the way in which it has been appointed, and the appointment of the committee does not in any way show any urgency in dealing with this matter. So far as I am concerned, it seems to me that from the case as put forward by the hon. the Home Member himself, this is not an urgent matter at all, and that it ought to await the final realization of the fines that have been imposed.

"There is another complication in the matter. The claim, the hon. the Home Member himself admitted, is not a legal claim, and that it is out of grace that the Government want to help these people. By no means have we seen the end of these claims for compensation. The amounts have been given as loans to certain people who applied for them. There are a number of people, public servants and others who have laid claim for compensation in this connexion. I was told, Sir—I speak subject to correction—that the claims of adhikaris and other people who are serving the Government, alone come to about Rs. 20,00,000."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I may say that I think the figure I gave the hon. Member was a little more than Rs. 4,00,000."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"And there are others, quite a large number of people who have not laid their claims before the Government and we do not really know what the extent of the claims will be. Before we distribute the money we ought to be in a position to know what are all the claims and how we are going to distribute the amount so as to meet them. In the course of the discussion it was suggested, that the claims"

2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" May I know, Sir, which discussion the hon. Member is referring to ? "

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am referring, Sir, to the discussion in the Finance Committee, and in the course of that discussion it was suggested that the claims might amount to a large figure. The claim on behalf of the Malabar District Board alone, to set right roads and bridges, came to 3 or 4 lakhs. There were several claims like that and it was said that we could not really know what the total amount under this head was going to be. It might be Rs. 20,00,000 or it might be more, or it might be less. That is how we stand."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TUDHUR :—" May I explain for a moment, Sir ? The figure Rs. 20,00,000 includes the present amount of Rs. 10,00,000, as also the claims of adhikaris and others. It is not in addition to this grant now asked for."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" That is what I am saying. So, the whole claim may come up to Rs. 20,00,000 or more or less. But we shall have actually these Rs. 11,00,000 to distribute among all the claimants. If you are going to anticipate the Rs. 9,00,000 and write off the whole amount of the loan now, what are you going to do with the other claims which may come in ?

11-30 a.m. " We can only distribute the amounts available among all the claimants. We cannot anticipate and write off the amount to the extent of Rs. 9 lakhs and tell the other people that we have already done this and that we are not going to pay any further compensation. Is this not the position that we are asked to take on the matter ? The hon. the Home Member himself has stated that a committee is going to sit or is sitting already. Supposing a larger number of applications for compensation are put forward and the committee think that a large amount is necessary, what are you going to do ? Are you going to say that the Rs. 9 lakhs anticipated have already been written off and that we have no funds or is the hon. the Home Member going to come and say to the House ' you have already sanctioned this grant and so you ought to sanction another 9 lakhs ? ' That being the position, Sir, I think it is a little premature to dispose of this question at the present moment. The proper course for the disposal of this question will be when we have realized all the fines or when we have collected whatever we have been able to realize, to distribute the amounts realized among all the claimants that come forward. As I said, there is absolutely no urgency about the matter. The people who suffered during the rebellion have got over the difficulty, and why should we go out of the way and write off all those loans, when we have for that purpose to anticipate to realize a collection of 9 lakhs in dribblets in two years. On this ground, I think we cannot pass the grant as put forward. I have been given some details in the Finance Committee as usual, and we were also told that out of the 9 lakhs so distributed about Rs. $4\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs were distributed in small amounts of Rs. 100 and less to small owners. Probably in their case the Council may agree to write off the loans. But with regard to the remaining items some sort of discretion will have to be used whether the whole of the amount should be written off or only a portion of this class only should be written off. This is a matter which will have to be gone into after

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

the realization of the fines and after ascertaining the number of claimants for damages. Sir, it is not a case which we can dispose of at the present moment; there is no hurry about it; and there are a lot of things of a very complicated character to be settled before we can finally dispose of it. For these reasons, I would earnestly request the hon. the Home Member to consider whether he might not drop this demand at the present moment; but if he chooses to press it, I for one will have to vote against it. I may also say that the Finance Committee was equally divided when this question was discussed."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—"As the hon. the Home Member himself said, this matter seems to be rather a complicated one. But after the information supplied by him and after it has been supplemented by the hon. Member who was in the Finance Committee, I understand the position of the Government with regard to this supplementary grant is something like this: fines to the extent of about Rs. 11 lakhs have been levied upon those who misbehaved during the rebellion and out of this amount Rs. 2 lakhs have been collected and Government hope to collect the balance of Rs. 9 lakhs in the course of the next two years. In the meantime, I understand that Government have given by way of loans an amount to the extent of Rs. 9 lakhs, which I suppose have been distributed among the various people who suffered during the rebellion. And if I have understood the hon. the Home Member correctly, the supplementary grant that he now asks the House to vote is for the purpose of writing off these loans of Rs. 9 lakhs that have been granted to the sufferers in the rebellion. So far, Sir, I think I have understood him correctly. But I could not understand the next thing he said. He stated that he had appointed a committee which was investigating into the matter of how compensation was to be given to others, and he asked us to give this sum of Rs. 10 lakhs for the purpose. Now, if, as he suggested in the first portion of his speech, Rs. 9 lakhs out of this Rs. 10 lakhs are simply for writing off the loans already granted, is the committee appointed by the Home Member only to find out the ways and means of distributing this Rs. 1 lakh or is he going to say to this House that 'the committee I have appointed wants another 10 lakhs to relieve the sufferings of other people' and ask for a supplementary grant of Rs. 10 lakhs? That is a point which I cannot understand. Moreover, when he tells us that Rs. 9 lakhs have for the present been advanced in the shape of loans to sufferers, one would naturally like to know the classification of sufferers to whom these loans have been advanced. No doubt, as the hon. the Home Member himself pointed out, the Government is under no obligation to compensate people who suffered in rebellions like this. But in giving any sort of compensation at all, I have no doubt the House will agree with me when I say that we must make a differentiation between the class of people who do deserve compensation and a certain other class who can afford to put up with such losses and who do not deserve compensation from our hands; so that out of Rs. 9 lakhs distributed as loans, if I have understood my hon. friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar correctly, an amount to the extent of Rs. 4 lakhs has been distributed in small loans of Rs. 100 and less, and evidently the other Rs. 5 lakhs must have been distributed in big sums. If these Rs. 5 lakhs have been distributed in big sums, I would not be making an extravagant demand if I asked whether before writing off

2nd February 1923] [Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar]

Grant XXXII—cont.

these Rs. 5 lakhs we are not entitled to know the class of persons who have taken those Rs. 5 lakhs of loans ('Hear, hear' from Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai) and whether it will not be proper for us to insist on the return of those loans treating them simply as a temporary relief, unless we find that they are also entitled to be excused them. So, I, for one, am not in a position to say from the information supplied by the hon. the Home Member whether Government will be justified, and whether this House will be justified in allowing Government to write off the whole amount of Rs. 9 lakhs as it stands. Even if we had the information, I do not see any reason why these Rs. 10 lakhs should be written off at present. As the Home Member has said, he has every hope of realizing Rs. 9 lakhs that are outstanding as fines to be collected. If the loans that have now been granted have been granted on the distinct understanding that they will not be free from interest for more than one year, I do not see any objection for Government to extending that time of grace for another year and to wait and see how much of the Rs. 9 lakhs will be collected and then come to this House and ask to vote for a certain amount of money for writing off loans. In these circumstances, Sir, I think I am justified in requesting the hon. the Home Member not to ask this House at the present stage to vote for this supplementary grant."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, it has been stated before the House that loans to the extent of Rs. 9 lakhs have already been made to those who suffered in the Mappilla rebellion. Out of those who received those loans there must be poor persons and rich persons. Some months ago, I interpellated the Government on this subject—I speak subject to correction as I do not remember the exact figure now and I did not expect this discussion to come on now—and my recollection is that in answer to my question the Government said that about Rs. 3 lakhs or so roughly—I am speaking in round numbers—were given till then to rubber plantation companies and other companies as loans and other amounts to other persons. With reference to the loans that have been granted to poor persons, the hon. Mr. Knapp suggested that they should be written off and treated as grants. I think that is based on a sound principle. I would suggest that loans of Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 and less might thus be written off and might be converted into grants. But I believe, as my friends who preceded me have stated, there is no need now to convert the other loans into grants and to write them off. The hon. the Home Member himself stated that a fine of Rs. 11 lakhs have been levied on the Mappilla prisoners, that Rs. 2 lakhs have already been collected and that the Government expect to collect Rs. 9 lakhs. It is quite possible that the Government's anticipations may not be realized. However, the Government now hope to realize an yield of Rs. 9 lakhs from the remaining fines. So, the time for considering whether those small loans up to a limit of Rs. 100 should be written off and converted into grants will properly arise only after the Government are in a position to state that they have realized the whole of the Rs. 9 lakhs or that they were able to realize only so much and are unable to realize the remainder. It is only when the whole of the anticipated fines are either collected, or after they have found that they are not able to collect some portion of them, that the time for converting these loans into grants will arise. So far as that goes, all the hon. Members will agree that this demand is premature."

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

"Then, we have to consider the larger loans of more than Rs. 100. In the case of those persons who have received larger sums as loans, I think—I am speaking subject to correction because full materials are not before the House—they must be in a position to repay these loans, or in any case portions of them. I believe in the case of those companies, which were referred to in the answer by the Government to my question, there must be at any rate some companies which may be in a position to repay the amount. So also other rich persons, such as rich private individuals and agriculturists who have received comparatively large loans, must be able to repay them. In the case of the companies, it is quite possible that some of them have insured their estates, and in that case it will be possible for them to realize the whole or in any case a portion of the amount lost from the insurance companies. With reference to this question of Rs. 9 lakhs, the committee that has already been appointed by the Government with Mr. Macmichael as President might legitimately and reasonably and properly be asked to go into the details and make a report to the Government.

"It is only after all these details have been settled—viz., whether private individuals who have received large grants are able to repay the whole or part of their amount and whether the companies are going to repay their amount or whether all or any of those are in a position to deserve compensation for any portion of the damages they have suffered and have been furnished to the House,—that it will be in a position to say whether it is necessary to write off the loans and convert them into grants. My hon. friend, the hon. the Home Member, has stated that a committee has already been appointed to consider this, and that, in addition to the 9 lakhs that have been granted, it will be necessary hereafter to give some loans to persons who are non-agriculturists and who have not yet come forward with their claims."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I did not say 'loans'. I said 'grants'."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"There are non-agricultural persons who till now, though the rebellion which began in August 1921 ended early last year, have not come forward with any claims. . . ."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I did not say that they have not applied for grants. They put in their claims for compensation many months ago."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It seems that they have applied for grants, but that they have not yet been granted. If that is the case, where is the necessity now for this grant, before the fines have been collected and before the Budget is introduced at the end of this month. I submit there is no need whatever to vote for any amount for this purpose. My friend further stated that there was the question of damages. Reparation for damages is a very legitimate idea no doubt. But here again no materials are placed before us and, as Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar said, I do not blame the Government for appointing a committee to consider this question. What I suggest is this: Let this committee make a report saying what amount, either accurate or probable, will be necessary to be granted to persons whose buildings have been destroyed. Let us know where we stand. Let us know what amount will be necessary to grant on account of this rebellion. Let us know from the committee headed by Mr. Macmichael

2nd February 1923]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

Grant XXXII—cont.

what amount will be necessary for payment to companies, what amount is likely to be obtained from the insurance companies, and all that. Let us know also what amount of fines the Government have been so far able to collect. When we are in possession of all these facts, we can proceed to consider this grant. So far as I am able to understand, the Government are granting compensation to the poor people in Malabar and it is necessary to wipe off loans already granted. As it is stated that the loans have been granted with interest for one year, where is the necessity to remit them now? It may be a great hardship. In any case, so far as the present demand is concerned, I submit, it is premature and that the House should not proceed to consider it. I do not say that this demand need not be granted when the proper time comes. That would depend upon the circumstances prevalent then. Therefore, I suggest to my hon. friend, the Home Member, that this demand may be postponed until all the details absolutely necessary for coming to a correct conclusion are furnished to the House. But if the Home Member proceeds to press his demand then, it is my humble opinion that the proper course for the House would be to reject it."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I must oppose the present motion for the supplementary grant. Before offering any remarks further, I must take exception to the way in which these demands are sprung upon the House without notice. I take it, Sir, that the hon. the Home Member was aware that this demand should be applied for long long ago; if so, I fail to see why he should have delayed his application and put it before us to-day without any notice whatsoever. That is one thing which I want to say at the outset.

"Another thing is that the hon. the Home Member has not placed the House in full possession of facts to enable it to judge whether this grant should be granted or not. For example, my Muhammadan colleagues would like to know how this amount, if granted, will be distributed among the sufferers there. Will it be restricted altogether to the Hindu sufferers or will it be given to the Mappilas also or will the Muhammadan brethren be denied any help on the ground of alleged disloyalty, etc.?"

"My friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, referred to certain companies which might not be in need of this help. That is a point about which we should like to have more information. Are the companies really in need of this help? Can they not meet the loss they have sustained otherwise? That is a thing which we have to ponder over. I may say for the information of the Government that there have been for a long time past ugly rumours to the effect that certain companies in which very influential people have certain interests were going to be benefited out of the State money. I am not able at present to make myself responsible for the accuracy of those rumours, but anyhow I think the Government will be well advised if they do not proceed further with this application for grant. Give enough time for the Council to think over this matter, place the House in full possession of relevant facts and then press for the application of this grant.

"As regards the poorer people, I do not think the House will stand in the way of any grant being given to them. I do not know, under what provision, loans to poor agriculturists—loans under Rs. 100—have been granted. If they have been granted under the Agricultural Loans Act, I think the

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

Government have power under that Act to remit the collection of the amounts altogether or to suspend the collection for some time longer. So, I do not see where any urgency comes in, in the case of such loans and if it is for the Rubber companies, I should say that they are rich enough to afford to take the money, if finally sanctioned, some time later. Looked at from any point of view, I think the motion before the House is very premature and I would appeal to the hon. the Home Member not to proceed further with his application."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—"Sir, as one who did some little service immediately after the troubles in Malabar were over and as one who went and visited the affected houses and temples. I feel it my duty to vote against this grant. For, I found during my inquiry that there were conflicting interests set up by different bodies and there were a number of societies and groups of people, some recognized and some discredited, holding inquiries. Again there is the fact that the Servants of India Society headed by Mr. Devadas has been collecting large sums of money and the whole amount has not yet been spent: there is a certain amount still remaining that is set apart for relief in Malabar. The Government themselves had not made up their mind as to the exact scope and nature of the relief to be given at the time when I was there. The hon. the Home Member was pleased to say that one of the institutions which obtained some relief was a Hindu temple. I visited two or three Hindu temples which were entered into and desecrated during the rebellion and I know the nature of the damage that was done. In many cases it was not of any substantial character if you think of brick and mortar, but if you think of the sentiment, no value can be placed upon the desecration if it is understood what it is to repair a temple into a fitting condition once it is desecrated. It depends upon the length of the purse of the temple authorities. A sum of ten lakhs was spent on one single institution some years ago. This is a matter in which one has to be very delicate and it requires more inquiry and judicious adjustment of our resources rather than searching round the various fields where relief must be given. It is not a matter to be inquired into by Government officials or by Government committees but one to be entrusted to local philanthropic associations who have made it their avowed duty to render social service and assistance. I therefore think that, before we can do anything in the matter, we must be in a position to know what exactly the condition of things is. I request the hon. the Home Member to place before the House all the papers connected with this matter and to entrust the inquiry to non-official people who are already doing their duty. We do not want anybody from outside to be imported, we want that they should be neither Mappillas nor Malayalis, but those who are there, who have seen things done and who could be expected to approach this difficult task with some degree of impartiality."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—"Sir, the discussion that has now taken place provokes me to call for information on one or two points. It is said that about 4½ lakhs have been distributed among rich people. I want to know what is the total number of those who have appropriated these 4½ lakhs and what is the highest amount of grant that has been made out of this sum."

2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:— “Sir, I rise to oppose this supplementary demand, and in doing so, I wish to draw the attention of
12 noon.

the House to one or two principal aspects of the matter. So far as my information goes, the number of private individuals to whom loans have been granted is 17,000 and if we take the total amount given to them, it seems to work out an average of Rs. 25 per head. With respect to the other $4\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs that seems to have been advanced to large concerns, planting concerns and others, the question arises, if all these loans are now sought to be converted into gratuitous relief, why was not gratuitous relief admitted as the principal policy at the time when the crisis in Malabar was at its highest and distress at its worst? In those days, in spite of many representations made, the Government sternly discountenanced the idea of gratuitous relief and left it entirely to private philanthropic agencies. The Government undertook to grant only loans and they were of two kinds: the first was loan *with* interest to the Mappillas and the second was *without* interest to non-Mappillas. One of the questions that arises is, are also the Mappillas to whom loans were given to be benefited by this, or is this amount asked for solely to benefit those to whom loans were granted without interest?

“With respect to the industrial concerns, it seems to me that the market conditions to-day are much better than they were when these loans were granted. The price of rubber and I believe that of tea also have gone up and therefore those industrial concerns ought to be in a position to face the situation much better to-day than they were when they received loans. If at the time of distress, the Government felt that it was not gratuitous relief that ought to be given but loans, what has made them reconsider the situation to-day and come forward at a time when the market conditions are good with a proposal that these loans must be written off and converted into gratuitous relief? This is the big question of principle which I should like to place before this House. Had only the Government realized long ago that it was gratuitous relief that ought to be given, then I am quite sure a larger number of applications would have been made for relief. More people would have approached the Government for help. Having adopted the policy which acted as a deterrent on the number of applications and which only enabled the better and well-to-do class of people to take advantage of it, now to turn round and say that we should adopt the principle of poor relief seems to me to be a grievous insult and injury to Malabar. I do not wish to pursue this aspect of the question, but I should like to have more information than what has been given so far by the hon. the Home Member. Many of the hon. Members have already mentioned a number of items on which information is lacking.

“Finally, I would say that I agree with the Government in saying that compensation as a principle, as a claim or as a right does not arise. I would prefer that at this time of the day after things have begun to settle down we stuck fast to the principle rather than go back upon it and revise it in a manner which, as I just now mentioned, is objectionable from so many points of view. The Government have started on the assumption of giving loans and they should stick to it. Again, I do not like the idea that the anticipated income from the fines imposed upon the Mappilla prisoners should be in any way connected with the question of compensation. Sir, a great deal

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

may be said on the abstract theory whether the culprit should not be made to pay reparations, damages, or indemnity, or whatever term you like to call it by, to the fullest possible extent. It is not an abstract theory that this Council should discuss. The Council has to see whether it is a wise measure, whether it is a prudential measure, and what will be the consequence of it. The consequence will be that one set of people in Malabar will depend on what fines can be collected from another set of people for getting relief and in lieu of the grants they asked for. By this measure you would be fanning the dying embers in Malabar and for years and years together it would be the interest of non-Mappillas there to see that every drop of blood that could possibly be squeezed is squeezed out from the Mappillas. Now I ask, whatever may be the logic of it and whatever may be its justification as an abstract theory, is that the way in which a Government which wants to compose differences, to heal sore wounds and to set the feet of Malabar once again on the path of peace and progress, should proceed? I feel greatly distressed to take part in this discussion, but it is with no light heart that I rise to oppose this demand. Rather than this demand should be thrown out by this House, I would request the hon. the Home Member whether he could not see his way to withdraw it for the present and to go into the question once again more carefully and see whether a more satisfactory solution may not be arrived at."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I am sorry to say that if this demand is not withdrawn, I have to join with those who opposed it. In the first place, looking at the language of the application for grant and comparing it with what has been stated by the hon. the Home Member as to the real circumstance of the case, I am afraid that the application is made in language which is not quite accurate. It is stated that the Government should be granted an additional sum of Rs. 10 lakhs under '47. Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous and unforeseen charges—' on account of compensation to be made for losses sustained during the recent Mappilla rebellion in Malabar. I gather from what has been stated by the hon. the Home Member that nearly nine lakhs out of the ten lakhs asked for have already been distributed. It is only the remaining one lakh together with a sum of 1½ or two lakhs that may be collected in the shape of fines which may have again to be distributed: so that the whole ten lakhs asked for is not intended for distribution. Strictly speaking, the language is not accurate unless it is sought to justify it on the ground that what has been hitherto given was loan and what is hereafter intended to be done is to convert these loans into free gifts. So much as to the language.

"Then coming to the supplementary demand, as far as I understood the hon. the Home Member, he said that what he asked the House was to permit the sum of ten lakhs shown in the loan budget to be converted into a revenue head. It amounts to saying that in respect of what was given from monies borrowed from the Government of India for the purpose of lending to the sufferers in Malabar, let us now pay this money out of the revenues of our province. The Government of India stood as creditor for the recovery of these monies till now from those tenants and the Provincial Government was in the position of a guarantor. Now it is sought to give the monies from the provincial revenues: so that the loan which was obtained from the Government of India will be repaid and the Local Government will convert itself

2nd February 1923] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiayar]

Grant XXXII—cont.

into a creditor of these persons who have taken loan and look to the fines that have been imposed for the repayment of the loans. Optimistic officers in Malabar feel that they will be able to collect in course of time all the fines imposed on the Mappillas. We are now asked by this demand to pay out of provincial revenue what we have allowed to be given by way of relief from loan funds.

"While things are taking such a course, and while the Government are trying to give away such large sums of money by way of gift to the sufferers in Malabar, well may my hon. friends Messrs. Ranganatha Mudaliyar and Sivasankaram Pillai ask why should not the claims of Bellary and Kurnool which have long been suffering from the ravages of famine be considered and relief extended to them? It is well that they should ask for relief because the Government are dealing with provincial revenues which have been derived from the ratepayers and the taxpayers throughout the Presidency."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"The money in question was not derived from the ratepayers and the taxpayers in the Presidency, but is collected from the Mappillas who were convicted of offences."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"May I remind the hon. the Home Member that the expenditure for the martial law courts and for a lot of other items was incurred from the provincial revenues?"

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"So, Sir, we are asked to make ourselves responsible for this loan and make ourselves the principal creditors instead of the Government of India in the belief that the disorderly people who have been sent to gaol and who have been let out will keep their promise and be able to pay the fines imposed upon them. Indeed, that is a very slender thread on which to hang our hopes."

"Then, Sir, another question arises and it is this. Is it proper for us to decide, while we are at the fag end of the session, the question of principle involved in this demand, namely, when riots and disorders or rebellion break out whether the Government stands in the position of insurers of its subjects against the loss which they may sustain or whether their duty is only to alleviate distress to a certain extent not by free gifts but by some financial assistance at the time of distress, such assistance being repayable in times of plenty? Such a question I raised a year ago in the Finance Committee when applications for relief were made on behalf of officers who lost their all including their kith and kin. Indeed, such pathetic cases might be dealt with sympathetically, but only we wanted to know the exact amount of liability which the State would be called upon to meet. After proper information was collected, we were only prepared to give them a grant of a loan. That principle has always been recognized, but it is now sought to get the sanction of this Council not to recognize the well-defined principle of giving relief in the shape of loans, but to countenance that of free gifts."

"I understand that a committee is investigating the matter of giving relief in Malabar and, before we have exact information as to our total liabilities, we are called upon to accede to a grant of 10 lakhs. By giving our assent to this demand of 10 lakhs we might find ourselves committed to a principle which we cannot go back upon and which we cannot help applying when the full liability shall have been ascertained. For aught we know, our full liability may be 40 lakhs or 50 lakhs or it may even go to 100 lakhs."

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

"Again, Sir, it is said that the fines which have been collected from the Mappillas ought to be applied to those who have suffered and to whom we have promised reliefs. True, has not the Government itself incurred a good many charges on account of the Mappilla outbreak? What about the 4·20 lakhs which the Council sanctioned the other day for increase in the jail accommodation on account of the increase in the jail population? What about the Law and Order departments which have been strengthened on account of this Mappilla rebellion? Not that I am wanting in sympathy with the people in Malabar, but that I do want that, before we take a step, we should count the cost thereof and we should have a regulated system by which we can ascertain the total amount of our liability and the respective or the comparative claims of individuals for assistance. Let us not give relief to those who have borrowed on the footing that they will in course of time be able to repay the loan.

"It was also stated that this additional sum of one lakh was intended to give relief to those who had not asked for it. Yes, they have not asked for it in the shape of loans, but I gather from the hon. the Home Member's remarks that they have asked for it in the shape of compensation. That means they honestly realize that they will not be able to repay what they get and therefore they ask for it as a free gift. So, to those who feel that they are in a better position to repay in course of time, you say what you have given is a free gift and you say the same thing also to those who have the sense of honesty to say that they are not able to repay the loan. We do not know to what extent the amount will be utilized for the relief of the officers who have asked. Now, Sir, having regard to the fact that such relief as has been asked for has already been given and therefore there is no distress which requires to be remedied at the present moment, this grant seems to me to be unnecessary and can be brought forward again when a full discussion of the total liability of the Government is ascertained and when it is finally decided how far relief should be given to all the claimants. Till that time, I think the consideration of this demand should be postponed. Under these circumstances, I appeal to the House to reject this demand if it is not withdrawn."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR :—"May I ask the hon. the Home Member who it was that distributed the loans at the

12-15 p.m. time of granting loans, whether they were distributed by Government officers or whether they were distributed by a committee? That the loans that were granted to poor people should be written off and that grants to landlords should be recovered seem to me to be unreasonable. Such a distinction between the two is not advisable. If poor people are unable to pay their debts, more time should be allowed for them to pay off their debts. The loans that have been given to them should remain as loans and not as grants."

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—"Sir, the proposal is to write off some loans advanced to certain class of sufferers in the Mappilla outbreak in Malabar and to provide funds to enable the Government to award compensation for certain other class of sufferers. If I understand the hon. the Home Member correctly a sum of 4½ lakhs has been already disbursed among 17,000 odd people on loans of Rs. 100 and smaller denominations to help them to set up in life after the disturbance. Evidently these are poor people and no

2nd February 1923] [Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan]

Grant XXXII—cont.

body can have the least objection to write off these loans. I take it that loans of larger denominations must have been given to landholders, planters and other people who are better off and therefore stand on a different footing altogether. No doubt, the planters have suffered a good deal; but I am distinctly of opinion that the loans that were given to them were all they could legitimately hope to get if there was no legal obligation on the part of the Government to compensate for damages caused in the rebellion. They do not deserve any grant or compensation especially in view of the fact that recently the value of coffee, rubber and tea has very much increased. The other richer class of people, the landholders for instance, can have no cause for complaint and must be satisfied if the Government have given them loans to tide over their difficulties. The landholders do not want anything at the hands of the Government done as an 'act of grace'. We have heard that phrase repeated more than once."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Does my hon. friend say that as representing the landlords of Malabar?"

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN:—"Yes, Sir, I am speaking on behalf of the jennies, my constituents. I had occasion to consult several of them and they still hold that Government are under legal obligation to compensate them for losses suffered in the rebellion. They do not want anything as an 'act of grace' and further the policy of showing kindness and grace is not in keeping with the treatment hitherto accorded to them. The assessments on estates looted and destroyed by the rebels, and on fields that were harvested by them have all been recovered by coercive process and the authorities were not pleased even to grant an extension of time to pay up these dues. That, Sir, was the sort of rigorous treatment accorded to the landholders living in the rebel area.

"There is yet another class of people who deserve very kind treatment, I mean the owners and *Uralans* of temples that were destroyed during the rebellion. The Mappilla considers the mosque sacrosanct while he thinks he can desecrate the Hindu temples with impunity. That is a mentality I can hardly understand. There are hundreds of temples that were pulled down and whose idols were broken. Full compensation for rebuilding and purifying such temples has to be given and the money for the purpose has to be found from the fines levied from the Mappillas or from other sources. I have strong feelings on this matter. These are the observations which I wish to make."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"The discussion which has so far proceeded must have reminded the hon. Members of this House that there is keen difference of opinion regarding this grant and I shall only put it to the hon. the Home Member whether he thinks it worth while to press his motion at this stage in the absence of complete information and when we are expecting a very complete statement about the financial prospects at the end of this month. It is a matter for serious consideration as to whether it is a correct principle to mix up the question of the levy of fines with the question of compensation to be granted to sufferers; and I am inclined to agree with Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi in his view that there should not be any such connexion established between the two. It is again a matter for serious consideration whether, when once the Government have

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

embarked upon a policy of giving loans, it is correct that we should depart from that principle without taking all possible steps for their recovery. If the terms originally granted for their recovery and the instalments granted are not sufficient for the purpose of recovering them, it is quite desirable that the terms are altered, and further instalments and better facilities are given for the payment of these loans. I think it will be creating a very unwholesome precedent if, after once starting the principle of giving loans, we go back upon that principle and write off those loans and practically convert them into grants. More than that, I should think that if the Government upon a further investigation finds—of course it is proposed to appoint a committee—that it is absolutely desirable to give relief to the poorer people among the sufferers, they may come before the House with a demand for supplementary grant. To ask this House to vote at the present stage with imperfect materials is very unreasonable.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, this grant is undoubtedly one of great complexity, as has been remarked by the hon. the mover. This complexity has still further increased by the fact that by way of information no papers or other materials have been furnished to the Members of this House before this grant had been tabled for discussion. I have many times complained in this House, absolutely without any effect, that when an important matter such as this is under discussion, the procedure for the Government should be a procedure of previous publication of the papers on the subject. I may illustrate the difficulty in dealing with matters such as this. My hon. friend, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, said that the total number of persons to whom loan was granted was according to his information 17,000. I should like to know where he got this information from. So far as I know I have not been furnished with any papers on the subject either before this debate or by means of the papers placed on the Editors’ table. Sir, several statements have also been made that relief by way of loans was granted to various persons and several of them are persons whose income or whose properties were worth Rs. 50 or Rs. 100, or that the amount of loan was . . . ”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ What I suggested was that loans to the extent of Rs. 100 or Rs. 150, should be remitted, because a portion of 10 lakhs of rupees which were distributed as loans had been covered by loans of Rs. 100 and Rs. 150.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Even on that subject we have not been supplied with any information or papers. Then, Sir, statements have been made on other subjects without notice, and we are told that a large portion of these nine lakhs or ten lakhs of rupees was given to rubber companies and plantations as loans. No information has been placed before this House as to whether any of these persons received loans, and if so, under what terms they were granted them, and under what particular circumstances we are asked to remit those amounts. I wish, in concluding this portion of my remarks, again to submit that if my hon. friend who moves a grant of this character merely says that he wishes to remit ten lakhs of rupees, certainly he will not get any support. In these circumstances, when all the facts I have mentioned have not been placed before us and when we are asked to give our assent to a demand of this character, it seems to me that my hon. friend is not at all treating us with

2nd February 1923] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Grant XXXII—cont.

courtesy. Having stated that, I must endorse everything that has been said by my hon. friend, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. If we are taking an attitude of hostility to this proposal, it is certainly not for want of sympathy with the sufferers of Malabar. I may say that we have every sympathy with them, but when my hon. friend opposite comes to us without any information and asks us to write off ten lakhs of rupees, it seems to me that we shall not be discharging our duty unless we make some attempt to satisfy ourselves whether my hon. friend is right.

"There is only one other aspect of this question. I need not repeat any arguments that have already been advanced. I have some dim recollection of having seen on the agenda of this Council some resolution asking for the appointment of a committee to find out ways and means for the compensation to be given to the sufferers in Malabar. I find on inquiry that notice of this resolution was given on the 18th August 1922 and this resolution has been of course blocked up on account of the overwhelming business of the hon. friend and his colleagues which had to be transacted in priority to the non-official business. The resolution purported not only to appoint a committee but also to decide exactly, in terms of that resolution, to consider to what sort of sufferers compensation should be granted and to record a finding on that matter. This matter has not been gone into and my hon. friend comes forward to take up the whole question and to write off the amount which was once distributed. I ask my hon. friend why, after having seen this resolution in the name of my friend, Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan, he did not think of appointing a committee either of this House or of persons who have an intimate knowledge of Malabar like my hon. friend Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar to go into this very question. If this matter had been put through, I am sure hon. Members would have been in a better position from the fullness of their report.

"Finally my friend said that Mr. Macmichael was looking into the Malabar affairs. I am certain that in connexion with this matter the local officers must have sent a number of reports as to how these loans were distributed, the classes of persons who received relief and the grounds on which the present request for writing off this amount was put forward, and if all these reports had been placed before us, and if my friend had only asked us for the grant in the light of such information, there would have been no difficulty in getting our assent. In the absence of such information, we have no other alternative but to reject this proposal in the circumstances which have transpired.

"In conclusion, I only wish to repeat that whatever we may say here, no impression should be created abroad that we are not willing to give relief to the sufferers of Malabar and I am certain that my hon. friend will devise ways and means for what has been done or is proposed to be done."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, may I, in the first place, apologize to the House and to the hon. Mr. Ramachandra Rao for what, I admit, was rather short notice given in this case?"

I was accused of holding this matter up without bringing it to the notice of this House, but that is not so. It was placed before the Finance Committee last Saturday, but the Finance Committee were unfortunately unable to make up their minds regarding it and left me in uncertainty as to how to proceed.

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

The interval between that and this is not, I think, very long, and I cannot be accused of delay. I sent in the notice yesterday, partly, as I explained, because it is urgent, and partly under the impression that there will be no opportunity for bringing forward this supplementary grant during the budget session, I thought it desirable to get it through this session. But I did not expect that it would be coming on this morning.

“Now, Sir, I am told by the hon. Member behind that I have been discourteous to this House because I have appointed a committee to consider this question.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“I said a committee for distribution, Sir.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“Not for distribution, Sir, but a committee to consider the whole question on the other hand. I am accused by Mr. Ramachandra Rao of having been discourteous to the Members of this House in not taking notice of a resolution asking for the appointment of such a committee. As a matter of fact, Sir, I had taken steps, but I could not get a committee actually appointed; for, as I explained to the House at the outset, there is no use in appointing a committee unless we have some kind of idea of the money we are going to allocate. There is no use asking a committee to sit on the matter and deal with the details without any idea of the money that will be available.

“Now, Sir, I must admit that when I came to this House this morning, I did so in the assumption that in one respect there was going to be no difficulty. I assumed, and I think I was quite justified in so assuming, that this House was not going totally to repudiate the undertaking which the Government gave, and although we are under no legal obligation to give compensation, I thought they would recognize the amount of suffering in Malabar and would allocate for the purpose of relieving the sufferers at least such money as might be realized by way of fines. I did not suppose, Sir, that the House was going to repudiate that. But, Sir, if the House is going to repudiate it,—and this, I take it, has been the trend of all the speeches—then I say that the assurance of deep sympathy for the sufferings in Malabar which came from the hon. Mr. Ramachandra Rao and the hon. Member behind, is worth very little. Whether the policy, which to my mind is an entirely proper one, is right or not, is a different matter. I say I came to the House with the assumption that that policy was not going to be repudiated. I am free to confess, Sir, my surprise at the point which Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar raised whether people should not be called to pay up their loans and whether Government should not keep its share of the fines.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“That is not what I said, Sir. The whole argument of mine was that we ought to know what we were going to collect by way of fines and then distribute. That was what I said.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar raised the question whether there were not demands on behalf of Government servants and others which ought also to come out of this amount.”

2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"When the hon. the Home Member said that it was not provincial revenue, I said, Sir, that it was provincial revenue so far as it bore expenditure with regard to the province things general. I said that we ought to calculate what we were going to collect by means of fines before distributing it. That was the whole gist of my argument from the beginning. When it was said by the hon. the Home Member that it was not provincial revenue and that it was coming from some other source, I said it was provincial revenue; the provincial revenue was contributing for all sorts of expenditure and so the fine was provincial revenue."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I am glad that there is at least one Member who does not desire to repudiate the promise made by the Government.

"Now, Sir, there is one point in connexion with this matter of which apparently no hon. Member at present is fully informed. There has been a certain amount of discussion as to the principle of using fines for the purpose of compensating sufferers. Under the Mappilla Act we have a provision for fines. The fine under the Mappilla Act is leviable from the whole Mappilla area, and however loyal a Mappilla may be, he is equally liable with his guilty neighbour to pay that fine. That system of fining is likely to cause a good deal of annoyance and discontent and it was partly on that account that, when we found that there were many thousands of people to be prosecuted, we came to the conclusion that if fines were imposed and recovered from them, this would probably be a way of escaping the imposition of a Mappilla Act fine for which I may say very large number of Hindus had been clamouring from the very beginning. Thus, Sir, as regards the principle of compensating sufferers out of the fines imposed on the Mappillas, the Mappilla Act recognizes it and it lays down that when fines have been collected under the Act, the first call on these fines is for compensation to those who have suffered. So far as the principle is concerned, therefore, Sir, we are not starting a new one. We are only proposing to apply a principle which has been in force for the last sixty years.

"Then Dr. Rama Rao (I don't see him in his place now) raised the question whether we propose to pay any enormous cost for the purpose of removing the pollution of some of the Hindu temples. So far as I know, that is not contemplated. The committee has been appointed to tackle the question only with reference to the material loss sustained by the temples.

"Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi in dealing with the whole question of principle regarding these fines made a remark which was of interest. He complained that by making the payment of compensation depend on the recovery of the fines from the Mappillas we would be keeping open the wound which we are all anxious to see healed. But, Sir, it seems to me that in coming, as I do, to the Council now and saying 'Give me this money for Heaven's sake, let me pay the compensation, and have done with it', I am only doing exactly what Mr. Ramalinga Reddi would wish.

"Mr. Tanikachalam Chettiyar, Sir, fell into a certain number of errors. He mentioned that certain persons never made claims. They made claims to the extent of many lakhs of rupees, but when we started the loan policy,

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII--cont.

we did so in accordance with certain established rules. The loans were granted under the Agriculturists' Loans Act. Only certain persons are qualified to come under that Act and take loans, and it is in regard to persons who are not so qualified that we now want to utilize the residue left after wiping out the loans. It is only fair that we should consider their claims. There is no question here, Sir, of inviting people to make their claims, nor do I see any prospect of their making any more claims. It is now 18 months, Sir, since the rebellion, and I have no reason to suppose that any more claims will come hereafter. By this time every-one who is going to claim has claimed.

"Sir, I have already explained that I was taken aback by the tendency on the part of the House to repudiate a promise of the Government which I thought they would accept as undoubtedly the proper policy, and that repudiation, Sir, has made a considerable difference in my position. I cannot but regard the refusal of the House to make this grant which is needed to give Malabar a chance of settling down as entirely unsympathetic, whatever may be said to the contrary. But in all the circumstances I have come to the conclusion that the best thing I can do is not to press the Demand now but to reserve it and put it forward in the next budget (cheers). May I have your permission, Sir, not to press it?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Will the hon. Member tell me under what Standing Order?"

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"In the absence of a Standing Order, Sir, I understand the matter to be in your discretion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will take the sense of the House. I think the question of notice was referred to by more than one Member. I called for the papers and I find that the hon. the Home Member's notice is dated the 31st January and it came to the Secretary only yesterday. He said therein that he wanted this thing to be put before the House on the 3rd February, i.e., to-morrow. As the Secretary rightly assumed that it was an urgent matter and as it was decided only yesterday that there was to be no meeting on Saturday, he put it in the agenda for to-day. I think I owe that explanation to the House for its having come in that form to-day."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

IV

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY, 1922--cont.

The following amendments were not moved:—

Clause 14—cont.

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—

100. *In item (2) for the word 'ten' wherever it occurs substitute the word 'seven'.*

2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—

100.-A. *In items (2) to (7) add at the end the words—*

‘according to the principle of proportionate representation by means of the single transferable vote’.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

101. *For the existing item (3) substitute the following :—*

‘one member for each district elected by the members of the district board, the district educational council and the municipalities in the district’.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

102. *In item (5) for the word ‘three’ substitute the word ‘two’.*

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“I beg to move the following amendment :—

103. *In item (5) for the word ‘three’ substitute the word ‘six’.*

“Sir, out of the 18 first-grade colleges that are connected with the university, both in the mufassal and Madras, six are situated in Madras. Out of 129 elected members, 102 go to the mufassal and only 27 for Madras, and of it again only three for the Madras proper and the rest, I think, go for the domiciled Madrassis. How I arrived at the figure 102 is this—50 seats from district boards and municipalities, 20 at least from the graduates, 10 from the affiliated colleges, all of which are situated in the mufassal, 5 at least from the academic council, 5 from the second-grade colleges, all of which are situated in the mufassal except one, 2 at least from the headmasters of schools and 2 from the landholders, etc.

“Sir, instead of Madras having 43 seats it has got only 27. I should ask for 15 more because Madras contains 4,000 out of 12,000 university-going students of whom over 100 belong to Madras and the others come from the mufassal. Madras has drawn into its various offices most of the intelligentia of the mufassal. Madras is now overflowing with a large number of floating population from the mufassal including members of the Legislative Council who make it a point of staying at least a week once a month. Madras has to look after the comforts and conveniences of these people. They are using a large quantity of water and they do not pay anything for it. (Laughter.) So I request the mufassal members to support me in getting at least 6 members instead of 3.”

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—“Sir, when the Bill was introduced I was one of those who thought that the Madras Corporation had not sufficient representation. I am obliged to Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar for having brought forward this amendment. But, Sir, if you permit me I will suggest to Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar in deference to the wishes of some of my friends that the number be reduced to 4. I think it will be acceptable to all concerned.”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“I have no objection, Sir, if the Minister is going to give us anything more. I accept the amendment.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR seconded the amendment.

The House having given its consent to the amendment of Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib, the amendment in the amended form was taken up for consideration.

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I quite appreciate the hon. mover of this amendment suggesting that Madras should have special consideration in view of various considerations such as the mufassalites having the benefit of drinking the Madras water and so forth. But the amendment suggested does not refer to whether Madras should have more representatives in the university or not. The question is that the Madras Corporation should have on the university three or four members. That is the only consideration. Then, Sir, taking into consideration the scheme of the Bill, I would request you to consider whether in the case of one corporate body it is proper to have four representatives. If it is any other body whose representation has to be increased, that will be a matter for consideration."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I am not personally convinced of the need or necessity for increasing the number in the case of the Corporation and hon. Members have not adduced any substantial reason except that their mufassal friends come here and take municipal water."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"I do not hear him. Perhaps hon. Members of the Corporation will be perfectly justified in levying any tax or any rate they like. But that they should tax them by way of admitting more representatives than they are entitled to is something which I cannot comprehend. However, as a matter of compromise, I would not object to having four members."

The motion was put and passed.

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—"I beg to move—

103-A. *In item (5) omit the words 'from amongst their own body.'*

"I think, Sir, this is an amendment which ought to be carried by this House, because we do not want to confine the seats to those who hold seats in the Corporation. There are gentlemen outside the Corporation of Madras who have very good qualifications for being members of the University of Madras. If my amendment is carried, gentlemen who are not members of the Corporation can become members of the Senate. Therefore, I feel that the words 'from amongst their own body' should be omitted from the Bill. I know that when the Madras Legislative Council was electing its Member to the Imperial Legislative Council, the choice was not restricted to the Members of the Madras Council but that even those who were not Members had a chance of getting in. Hence, I do not see any reason why the municipalities and corporations should restrict their choice."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"I second the amendment."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I have no objection if the Corporation members do not want to confine the membership among themselves."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI :—"I oppose the amendment for two reasons. In the first place, it is a reflection on the intellectual calibre of the members of the Corporation. Then they have no business to be given the right of electing representatives to the Senate. The argument of Mr. Usman Sahib cuts the ground under his feet. If he wants representation for these municipalities,

2nd February 1923]

[Mr. M. Ratnaswami]

Clause 14—cont.

I think it is because these municipal bodies are to be represented in the Senate. If they are to be given representation, they must elect the members from among themselves. This is one of those instances where one has to say, 'God save me from my friends; against my enemies I can take care of myself.'"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"I am sorry Professor Ratnaswami has taken this view. The Corporation is given representation to the university, not because the interests of the Corporation were in any way concerned with the university. If the interests of the Corporation were in any way going to be discussed in the university, then the members of the Corporation ought to be there. That is not all. The local boards and other bodies that are mentioned are only convenient electorates to send people to represent the places in which they are situated. For instance, for finding a convenient electorate the local boards and municipalities are mentioned, not that the interests of all the district boards and the municipalities are going to come the question in the university. That is not the idea at all. So, the particular members of the body which is sending the member do not in these cases represent this electorate alone. It may be, Sir, that the local boards that have to send these representatives find it difficult to get the proper men. The local boards are not constituted so as to contain academic men who will take part in university matters. Their purposes are quite different. They are to look after the sanitation, roads and such other things. That is the purpose for which the Corporation and the local bodies are constituted. So, if for the sake of convenience they are taken as constituencies, I think the proper way would be to elect whomsoever they think to be the best qualified to serve in the university. As I said, the very object of the representation of these bodies is to give a representation to the locality and not for representing the particular body itself. So I have very great pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by my friend Mr. Usman Sahib."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"As a member of the Corporation I am not at all convinced by the reasons adduced by Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar and I therefore oppose the amendment. If Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar's argument is accepted the municipalities and the district boards can have no representation and so they ought not to form a constituency. If that argument is pushed to its logical extent and if the district boards and the municipalities are to represent only the electoral area, then the only effect will be that the local boards and municipalities as such will have no seats. The Corporation consists of fifty people whereas the population is five lakhs. The district boards and municipalities should have very insignificant representation if such a comparison should be made. I cannot understand why any representation should be given to any municipality on this basis. Every municipality must have a right to elect its own representative. As my friend Mr. Ratnaswami put it, if there are no persons fit to stand in the electorate, for goodness sake let them not have any representation at all. You give them the right on the understanding that they have the right to send persons to serve on the Senate. I do not see any such distinction in the Bill."

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I heartily support the amendment of Mr. Usman Sahib."

A VOICE :—"He is withdrawing."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Anyway he has moved and the hon. the Minister has accepted it. I shall have my say. There is no meaning in saying that the nominees should be members of the bodies concerned. A municipality may be convinced that a gentleman who is not on that body may have the interest to represent the interests on the Senate and the discretion of the municipality ought not to be fettered in the way in which it is done."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—"I am as enthusiastic as my hon. friend, Mr. Ratnaswami, in safeguarding the interests of the members of the Corporation. But I moved this amendment because I thought we must always appreciate a wider field of election than a narrower one. The proposal is a democratic one and I do not see any reason why Mr. Ratnaswami should object to it. Anyhow I leave it to the House. I think it is a very necessary amendment and I press it."

The amendment was put and lost. A poll was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 13. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. |
| 2. " R. G. Grieve. | 14. Mr. C. V. Venkataranana Ayyangar. |
| 3. " E. Periyannayagam. | 15. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 4. " A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 16. " T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 17. " A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 6. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 18. Khan Sahib Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 7. " K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 19. Mr. Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib. |
| 8. " M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 20. Khan Sahib Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 9. " R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 21. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaq Sahib. |
| 10. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 22. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib. |
| 11. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | |
| 12. " C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Rev. E. M. Macphail. | 20. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 21. " C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 3. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 22. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 23. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimbacharlu. |
| 5. " T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 24. Diwan Bahadur Sir T. Desika Achariyar. |
| 6. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 25. Mr. M. R. Seturainam Ayyar. |
| 7. " W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 26. Rev. W. Weston. |
| 8. " K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 27. Mr. M. Soryanarayana. |
| 9. " B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 28. " T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 10. " P. C. Muttu Chettiyar. | 29. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 11. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 30. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 12. " M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 31. " M. Ratnaswami. |
| 13. " V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 32. Raja of Ramnad. |
| 14. " C. Ponnuswami Nayudu. | 33. Sri Meka V. Appa Rao Bahadur. |
| 15. " K. Sarabha Reddi. | 34. Rao Sahib M. O. Madurai Pillai. |
| 16. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 35. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 17. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | 36. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 18. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 37. Mr. A. M. MacDougall. |
| 19. Diwan Bahadur L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar. | 38. Rao Bahadur T. Numberumal Chettiyar. |
| | 39. Mr. A. E. Rencontre. |

2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Twenty-two having voted for and 39 against, the amendment was declared lost.

Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR :—" Sir, before I proceed to move my amendment, may I know from the hon. the Minister for Education, as a piece of information, the cogent reasons other than those mentioned in paragraph 8 of the Select Committee's report—that is,

(1) The reason why the proposal of insisting on the local bodies to make contributions for representing them in the Senate was rejected ; and

(2) In what way it would be helpful and advantageous if the local bodies were represented in the Senate ?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member had better decide whether he wants to move the amendment or not."

Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR :—" I want this information as it relates to my motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have no doubt about that. All the same, the hon. Member should make up his mind either to move his amendment or not."

Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR :—" I don't move it."

The following amendments were not moved :—

Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR :—

104. *In item (5) add the following at the end :—*

' Provided the Madras Corporation makes any reasonable contribution.'

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

105. *Omit item (6).*

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—

105-A. *Omit item (6).*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, there are two alternative amendments in my name, and I do not wish to move the first amendment. I move the following :—

106. *For item (6) substitute the following :—*

' (6) One member for each district elected by the members of the district board and by the municipal councillors of the municipalities in the district.

Provided that such election shall not take place unless such district board and municipalities in the district make together an annual contribution of not less than Rs. 3,000 to or for the purposes of the University. The member so elected shall be a member of the Senate for three years or so long as the annual contribution continues.'

" Sir, before I proceed to deal with the amendment, I request you to put the main clause and the proviso separately after the discussion is over.

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Instead of two members, one from the district board and the other from the municipal council as provided for in the existing item (6), I suggest in the first paragraph of this amendment that only one member should be elected by both these bodies together. To this paragraph I add a rider that these bodies should have the right of election only if they make a contribution. So I request that these two paragraphs may be put to the Council separately. Having made this submission, Sir, I leave it to you to decide.

"As regards the question of representation of district boards and municipalities, I have not been very much in favour of it. The Select Committee approves of it. Anyhow I do not wish to argue the question of representation of district boards and municipalities on the Senate. Having such a provision in the Bill, I only suggest that only one member may be elected by both these bodies together, instead of two, i.e., one by the district board and the other by the municipality. I further suggest that the right of election should be on condition that these bodies contribute something to the Senate. I submit that the right of municipal bodies to elect persons to the University elsewhere is conceded because they are making handsome donations towards the expenditure of the university. I do not wish to trouble the Council with figures, but I may say that the city of Leeds is paying £35,000 out of a total expenditure of nearly £120,000 incurred by the University. This condition of annual contribution by the district boards and municipalities may be resented by the presidents of district boards and chairmen of municipalities and I shall not be surprised if they only ask for representation without paying a single pie to the Corporation. I may also say that the Madras Corporation got off scot free as the amendment of my friend, Mr. Saiyid Ibrahim Rayutlar, was not pressed and, so far as I am concerned, it is due to an oversight that I have not sent notice of a similar amendment with regard to the Corporation of Madras. Having said so much, I do not wish to say further except request you to put the two parts of the amendment separately."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have given notice of an almost similar amendment with slight variations and I should like to give my support to the amendment moved by my hon. friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao. We have absolutely no quarrel over these local bodies having representation on the Senate. But our main point is, why should bodies which do not contribute anything to the Senate be enabled to claim representation? We think it necessary to limit the exercise of privilege to those bodies who make up their mind to make some contribution to and for the purpose of the University. I don't think I can do better than quote some observations contained in paragraph 4 of the minute of dissent signed by Mr. Ramachandra Rao and also by Mr. Narasimha Raju. They state:

There are precedents elsewhere in the charters of some of the Universities where municipal corporations contributing to the funds of the University are given the power of representation and a similar privilege may be accorded to the local bodies in this province but not without any contributions from them.

The reason given there seems to be perfectly logical and, in the absence of any contribution, there is no reason as to why these bodies should be

2nd February 1923] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

Clause 14—cont.

allowed to exercise this privilege. Therefore, this amendment has the merit of utility besides also acting as an incentive to these bodies to make the necessary contributions to entitle them to exercise this privilege.”

Diwan Bahadur Sir T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—“ Sir, I strongly oppose this motion made by my friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao. With reference to the exaction of contribution, I think that the thirty members elected by the registered graduates from among themselves according to the principle of proportionate representation by means of the single transferable vote are not bound to pay any money. The Academic Council is not bound to pay anything.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I may inform the hon. Member that the registered graduates pay a registration fee to the university.”

Diwan Bahadur Sir T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—“ May I remind my hon. friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, that all of us are paying kist to the Government and all of us pay professional tax and income tax? Twelve members are to be elected by the non-official members of the Legislative Council. What is the Legislative Council going to pay? I cannot understand why the district boards and municipalities alone should be asked to pay for sending their representatives to the Senate. I cannot understand why for the local bodies alone any exaction should be prescribed. In each district, the district board and municipalities are charged with very important functions, and it is but just and proper that they should be allowed the privilege of sending representatives to the Senate in Madras. Again, students from the mufassal come here in large numbers for their study and it is a matter of considerable importance, particularly for districts in which there are Affiliated Colleges and secondary grade colleges, that they must have an insight into the administration of affairs by the Senate. I do not see at all how, if the municipalities and district boards send their representatives, they are bound to pay any money at all for purposes of such representation. I strongly oppose this motion firstly on this ground. There is also another ground.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I am so thoroughly convinced of the reasons of my hon. friend that I do not wish to press my amendment.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following amendments were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

106-A. *Omit item (6).*

If this amendment is not carried, for the existing item (6) substitute the following :—

(6) one member for each district, elected by the non-official members of the district board and the municipalities from among themselves.

Provided that the district board and the municipalities in the district shall have made an annual contribution of not less than Rs. 4,000.

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Provided also that any member so elected shall continue as a member of the Senate for three years or so long as the annual contribution continues.'

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

107. *For item (6) substitute the following :—*

'(6) one member for each district, elected jointly by the members of the district board and the councillors of the municipalities in the district, from among themselves'.

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

108. *For item (6) substitute the following :—*

'(6) Fifty members elected by the members of the district boards and municipalities from among themselves in the manner provided in this behalf by the Chancellor by a notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.'

[NOTE.—If the member's amendment to item 5 is accepted, he will substitute 47 for 50 in this amendment.]

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

109. *Omit item (6), or if this is not carried, after the words 'each district' insert the words 'which contributes to the university an annual donation of not less than Rs. 5,000 to or for the purposes of the university'.*

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—

109-A. *In item (6) add at the end the following :—*

'provided that only such district boards and municipalities in the district shall be entitled to take part in the election as make a collective annual contribution of not less than Rs. 3,000 to or for the purposes of the university or for the benefit of higher education in the mufassal.'

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—

109-AA. *In item (6) omit the words 'from among themselves' wherever they occur.*

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

110. *In item (7) for the word 'two' wherever it occurs substitute the word 'one'.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

111. *In item (7) for the words 'two members' substitute the words 'one member' and for 'two' substitute 'one'.*

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—

111-A. *In item (7) after the words 'Madras Chamber of Commerce' omit the word 'and' and insert a semi-colon and add at the end the following :—*

'and two members elected by registered associations for the promotion of oriental languages, such as the Tamil Sangam, Madura ; the Telugu Academy'

2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

112. *In item (8) for 'two members' substitute 'one member'.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

113. *Omit item (9).*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I wish to move—

114. *In item (9) for the words 'to nominate one member to the Senate who shall be a member for five years' substitute the words 'to have the power as the case may be of being a member of the Senate or of nominating one member to it and the membership shall in each case be for five years'.*

"Sir, it is a very simple amendment and is meant to encourage people to give money more readily to the university. The provision, as it is, says that if a man pays a certain sum of money he has got the right of nominating somebody else for a certain period. He cannot get himself nominated."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"Where is it said that he cannot nominate himself? It is perfectly open to him either to nominate himself or choose somebody else."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"If the word 'nomination' includes himself also, I have no quarrel; only I want to make it more clear. A man does not nominate himself to a particular position, but he nominates others. But if it is said that the wording of the clause allows a man to nominate himself, I have no objection to withdraw the motion."

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—"There is no difficulty there."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following amendments were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

115. *Omit item (10).*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

116. *Insert the following as item (11) :—*

'(11) One member elected by the Telugu Academy.'

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

117. *Insert the following as item (12) :—*

'(12) One member elected by the Tamil Sangam.'

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I wish to move—

118. *Add the following as a new item after item (11) :—*

'(12) one member elected by the Madura Tamil Sangam and one by the Telugu Academy.'

"Sir, I need hardly expatiate on the fact that these institutions have been doing a lot of good and useful work in the field of education. And so far as the Madura Sangam, which is located in Madura, a classical seat of learning, is concerned, it has been doing a lot of useful work in collecting, preserving and re-writing old manuscripts and doing other research work.

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

It is also getting printed some of the old works which otherwise will have gone to decay. I am told, and I have reason to believe, that this Madura Tamil Sangam is an incorporated association registered under the Literary and Scientific Society Act. It has been in existence for nearly 22 years, having been started in 1901, and its past history and antecedents are such as to merit our respectful attention and consideration, and there is absolutely no justification to withhold representation from that body. Other things being equal, I shall submit to the consideration of the House that it should be given the right of electing one member, and likewise the Telugu Academy which I am told has been doing excellent work on precisely identical lines. It is, therefore, but reasonable, natural and legitimate that these two bodies whose object is the promotion of oriental learning and which are ancient bodies, should be given representation in this body-politic. With these words, I beg leave to move this amendment."

Rev. W. MESTON :—" I second it."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I am constrained to oppose this amendment. The practical difficulty is there are so many sangams and literary associations like the Madura Sangam that we cannot make a distinction between one sangam and another. Most of these bodies are equally old and are doing equally good work."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" ' Equally old and doing equally good work ' cannot be applied in the case of other sangams."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAV AYYAR :—" May I ask what other sangams the hon. the Minister had in view when he made that statement ? "

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" There is the Mussalman sangam, there is the Malabar sangam, there is the Reddi Mahajana sangam, and so on. As far as I know, these sangams have pressed for representation. Therefore, I find it difficult to draw a line in the case of all these sangams. Every one of them is doing educational and literary work. If any distinction is made, it will be felt to be invidious. Therefore, I am unable to accept the amendment proposed."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, my hon. friend's speech reminds me of an anecdote which I heard some time back. When a person was asked which was the proper time for performing Sandyavandanam, whether before a certain hour or after, and when a particular time was given, the person who inquired exclaimed ' there is a difference of opinion as to the time at which the prayer should be said, therefore I will not do any Sandyavandanam at all hereafter.' My hon. friend is similarly brushing aside all sangams because he could not come to an agreement as to which of them deserved and which did not deserve our recognition. If I may venture to point out what I think to be a *via media*, I would say that this amendment might be so modified as to include all well-established sangams."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I am to speak on the amendment as put forward and not to suggest any new amendment."

2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" But all the same I do believe that, though there may be a difference of opinion between my hon. friend and myself, still the duty devolves on the authors of the Bill to give effect to the principle involved in this amendment, irrespective of the difficulties that may have to be encountered in doing it."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" No case has been made out as to why one sangam should be distinguished from another in the matter of representation."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—" I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. the Minister in order in making this observation interrupting my hon. friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu? "

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" It is a personal explanation."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" You had better accept that explanation" (laughter).

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" I desire to note that the academic activities of the Madras University are also on the oriental side. Therefore, it is thought proper that those who represent these oriental studies should have representatives on the Senate. I have here an amendment, slightly modified from the present one, which, if permission be given, I seek to place before the House.

" It is something like this :—

' one member for each linguistic area, as determined by the Local Government, to be elected by such bodies within each area as might be recognized by statutes as promoting oriental learning and scholarship.'

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I accept it. I will withdraw mine and allow this to go forward."

The Council adjourned for lunch at 1-30 p.m.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m. with the hon. the Deputy President in the chair.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, I have the honour to submit the alternative amendment, alternative to amendments 116, 117 and 118, which I have been kindly permitted by the House to move. It runs, Sir, thus :—

' one member to represent each of the chief vernacular languages in the Presidency as determined by the Local Government to be elected by definite public bodies recognized by the University in accordance with the rules prescribed therefor.'

" Before submitting my remarks on this alternative amendment, Sir, I feel I owe it to myself and to the House to express a word of sincere regret for the somewhat unkind anecdote with which I began my remarks. I sincerely regret also the animus that I put into my words in the next two or three sentences. I regret that for those two or three minutes I forgot a noble precept which my revered teachers sought to impress upon me, viz., as I hurt another, I injure myself. Consequently, Sir, I owe it primarily to myself to express this regret. Nothing could have been easier for me to state it

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

personally to my old friend, the hon. the Minister, and say that I was sorry for it. But that would mean doing in private amends for what had been done publicly on the floor of this House.

“ Apart from that, Sir, I hold that the amendment is a very desirable provision to be incorporated in the Bill. As I have already submitted, the university has of recent years been making diverse provisions for the promotion of oriental learning through Indian classical and vernacular languages. Also there has been a feeling very much abroad that the Indian vernaculars have not been receiving their due share of attention and appreciation from the university. Alike in recognition of the fact that the university has already committed itself to an oriental side and as a sort of assurance for eliminating the dissatisfaction that is felt with reference to the treatment of the vernaculars by the university, I beg to submit this amendment. As I have already observed, the proposal is to provide in the Senate for the presence of one member to represent each of the chief vernaculars in the Presidency. On the one hand, Sir, therefore, this amendment does not contemplate languages which are not vernaculars. On the other, Sir, it also takes the precaution that any and every vernacular in whatever stage of literary development and spoken within however small an area, every tiny vernacular, might not claim this privilege. Thirdly, Sir, lest there should be any mutual wrangling or bickering between these several vernaculars, my amendment suggests that only such vernaculars as are determined by the Local Government as chief vernaculars shall be entitled to this privilege. When I suggested orally an alternative before we broke up for lunch, I used the expression ‘each linguistic area.’ But it occurred to me afterwards that Urdu was not really confined to any linguistic area, though it was one of the chief vernaculars of the Presidency. Therefore, Sir, I have modified it. Thus what is contemplated in this alternative amendment is the representation of each of the chief vernacular languages. Then, Sir, the power of representation should be exercised by election and the privilege of election should be accorded to definite public bodies, which should have been recognized by no less an authority than the university. And as to the method of election, rules shall be prescribed in accordance with the provisions of the Bill. These, Sir, are the chief implications of this amendment, and I trust that it will meet with the ready acceptance of this House. I shall not waste time by dilating on the advantages of this amendment or some amendment on these lines. It is, I believe, obvious to every hon. Member that it is intended to secure a certain measure of representation directly and specifically for the chief vernacular languages. As regards the additions likely hereby to be made to the total strength of the Senate, I believe they will not materially disturb the balance in the Senate. With these words, Sir, I submit this amendment for the consideration and acceptance of the House. As for the exact language of the amendment, of course, there is our hon. friend, the Advocate-General, who will make the necessary verbal alterations, and I am sure we shall not deny ourselves the benefit of his suggestions.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“ I second the motion.”

2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"To make room for the more comprehensive amendment of my friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, and to ease the situation, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, as to the spirit of this amendment I have no objection. But I think there are some difficulties in the way of accepting it. Firstly, with regard to the term 'definite public bodies' as they now exist, I am informed by the Director of Public Instruction that the list of vernacular academies run through about 60 pages in print. To constitute constituencies for returning the various bodies is a very complicated matter. Otherwise I do not at all oppose the spirit underlying this amendment, viz., that the vernaculars should have representation. Then the other difficulty is this. I have heard hon. Members say that those who know vernaculars will not also know the classical languages and so Sanskrit, Persian, Arabic and such other classical languages would not be included by the amendment. It is therefore a question whether to include classical languages also within the scope of the amendment. If these difficulties are solved, I have no objection to accept the spirit of the amendment, viz., the representation of the languages in the university, if the House so decides."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Apparently the hon. the Minister is not very enthusiastic about the matter. But seeing that there is such a widespread feeling in favour of giving representation to learned bodies in connexion with vernacular languages in the Senate, he apparently feels that he cannot altogether oppose it. I do not say that every association in every part of the country should be represented on the Senate. One of the avowed objects of this Bill is to create an academic atmosphere and foster learning. Are you going to have a university in Madras giving representation to the municipalities and district boards all over the Presidency and yet shut your eyes to the existence of learned associations in the province? The Madura Tamil Sangam has been certainly working for the advancement of Tamil language and literature for over twenty years and it is a well-recognized institution. If the Government want information about it, they may refer to the Madura District Gazetteer."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"My hon. friend has already referred to the history of the Madura Tamil Sangam, and I have absolutely no doubt as to the work it has done and as to its standing. With regard to the amendment, I only expressed my difficulties, though I strongly sympathize with the principle underlying it, namely, that vernaculars should have representation."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I quite see the difficulties which the hon. Minister has given expression to. But if there are about 63 pages of printed matter regarding these associations . . ."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—"May I just explain the position, Sir? Some years ago it fell to my lot to classify the associations in the districts under the heading 'Literary Associations,' and various societies came under the

[Mr. R. G. Grieve]

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

term. The list with the descriptions came to 66 pages of printed foolscap paper. But all of them were not connected with the vernaculars. To say so would be misleading."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I am glad that the hon. Member has given us the correct information. Boiling it down, the list of Literary Associations reduces itself to a few pages. I am not so selfish as to claim a representative for one particular association. What I submit is that associations which are for example incorporated under the Literary and Scientific Societies Act may be given representation. Some of them are doing very good work; their publications are prescribed as text-books even by the University of Madras; among their members are to be found the names of many illustrious men, for example, the Vice-Chancellor of the university, the Advocate-General, etc., and many gentlemen on this and the other side of the House; and they are surely associations which can be recognized and trusted to return representatives. To give these associations the privilege of sending a representative to the Senate will, I am sure, do credit to the university, bring honour to it and add to its popularity. What I say is that even according to the amendment of Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, it is not compulsory that every one of the associations should be recognized. It is open to the Government to recognize the languages which can be given the privilege, and then under due safeguards, under Ordinances, statutes or the like, to recognize certain associations. If more associations doing good work come into the field, they may be included in later lists. This, I hope, will solve the difficulty, and no more difficulties need be felt in that way."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, the original amendment suggested two definite bodies: one is the Tamil Sangam of Madura which, I understand, has history of 5,000 years behind it, and the second is the Telugu Academy. As regards the Telugu Academy, I may perhaps point out to the hon. Member that the Maharaja of Pithapuram, who takes very much interest in the improvement of the vernaculars, is one of the permanent members of that body, and I believe there are also several other members of the aristocracy in it. I also believe that my hon. friend, the Minister for Local Self-Government, is a member."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"I am not quite sure."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"My hon. friend says he is not quite sure. But I am sure his interest in the Telugu academy is such that it is rather surprising that he does not remember..."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I believe, Sir, there is another academy which is led by Rao Sahib Gidugu Ramamurti Pantulu. He leads one way and the Telugu Academy leads another."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"There must be somebody to lead one way and there will be another to lead the other way in all matters. But that is not the point. The Telugu Academy is a registered association, which was started about ten or fifteen years ago and of which every leading member of the aristocracy is a life member. Though one of its life members, I really forgot its constitution and, therefore, before I

2nd February 1923] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Clause 14—cont.

gave notice of my amendment, I wrote to its Secretary and satisfied myself that it was a registered association, and I am stating these facts after refreshing my memory as to the names of the gentlemen connected with it.

“As regards the other association to which my hon. friend referred, it is really an association started by a gentleman who feels that Telugu must be modernized, but that association is certainly not the Telugu academy which is a well-known association in the Telugu country.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Whatever may be the history of these two associations, the object of my hon. friend is really to secure representation to the exponents of the chief vernaculars.”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“Is the hon. Member, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, speaking on the withdrawn amendment?”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I won't do such a thing, Sir. I am speaking on the amendment of my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu. I am proceeding to explain that the whole question is in the hands of the Senate according to the old amendment and that the Senate may recognize these definite associations, though it cannot recognize all the associations mentioned in the 66 printed pages referred to by the Director of Public Instruction.

“Therefore the whole question is in the hands of the Senate according to the amendment. I may perhaps inform the hon. Members that in the constitution of the University of Calcutta proposed by Sir Michael Saddler, the President of the Bangi Sahitya Parishad was mentioned as a suitable ex-officio member, as also the Presidents of the Sanskrit Association and the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, just to mention three bodies doing considerable work in Bengal. Therefore, I think, that the proposal of my hon. friend to give this power to the Senate to recognize definite associations and then to give them the right of representation is a sound one, and seeing that my hon. friend, the Minister for Education, is in hearty sympathy with it, I hope he may accept it with any verbal alteration he may think necessary.”

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“Sir, I have been asked whether I should be satisfied with an amendment in the following form as drafted by the hon. the Advocate-General :—

‘One member to represent each of the chief languages in the Presidency to be chosen either by nomination or by election in such manner as may be prescribed.’

I feel considerable amount of reluctance in accepting this amendment only in respect of the words ‘chief languages.’ If the words ‘chief vernacular languages’ are substituted, I shall have no objection to accept the proposed amendment.”

“Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—“May I intervene for a moment, Sir. In regard to certain languages, it is conceivable that there might be no organized bodies and for such languages there might be a necessity to select one member by means of nomination. In regard to other

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

languages, there may be a plethora of material and in their case election may be resorted to, and the bodies may be constituted into constituencies. It is in view of these facts that I have drafted the amendment."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"I have not referred to that part of the draft, Sir. I only want that the words 'chief languages' should be substituted by 'chief vernacular languages.'"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"With your permission, Sir, and with the permission of the House I beg to move the following amendment :—

Add the following as item (12) :—

'One member to represent each of the chief vernacular languages in the Presidency to be chosen either by nomination or by election in such manner as may be prescribed.'

The permission was granted and the hon. the Minister moved the amendment as above.

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR seconded the motion.

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu withdrew his amendment.

The amendment of the hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro was put and carried.

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"I want to ask an important question, Sir. Is Urdu a chief vernacular?"

VOICES :—"Of course."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"The amendment has already been put and carried, and no further question can be asked."

The following amendments were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

119. (a) *Insert the following as item (13) :—*

'(13) One member elected by the teachers' guild.'

(b) *Re-number the existing item (11).*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

120. *In item (11) for the word 'thirty' substitute the word 'twenty'.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

121. *In item (11) for the word 'thirty' substitute 'ten' and omit all the words occurring after the word 'Chancellor'.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

122. *In item (11) for 'thirty' substitute 'twenty' and for 'twenty' substitute 'ten'.*

Last paragraph.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

123. *Before the words 'Save as otherwise provided' add the following :—*

'The manner of voting for the election of members to be elected under (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (10) shall be provided for in the statutes'.

2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

[*If the above amendment is not carried, before the words 'Save as otherwise provided' add the following :—*

'The voting for the election of members to be elected under (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (10) shall be according to the principle of proportionate representation by means of the single transferable vote.'"]

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—"Sir, I move the amendment which stands in my name and which runs thus :

123-A. *Omit the words 'or elected' occurring in the last paragraph.*

"Hon. Members will see from the last paragraph of Class III that all members other than ex officio members will hold office for three years, and that a member elected in his capacity as a member of a particular body or as the holder of a particular appointment shall hold office so long only within that period as he continues to be a member of that body or the holder of that appointment as the case may be. I have brought forward this amendment for seeing that in the case of the elected members, the term of office is three years. Otherwise they will have to eliminate some members of the Senate if they cease to be members of the body returning them. I want to see that the members returned by the municipalities and local boards continue to be members of the Senate for three years."

Mr. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR seconded the amendment.

The hon. Rai Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"My hon. friend, Mr. Narasimhaচারু wanted to amend the Madras Elementary Education Act, a few weeks ago, and the case mentioned by him was that there were members in the district educational councils who were no longer members of the bodies which had elected them. Their term of office had ceased in the municipalities or the taluk boards and they were no longer members of those local bodies. Nevertheless, he pointed out that such an anomaly existed, namely, that though their term of office as members of local boards or municipalities had ceased, yet they represented these local bodies and their interests in the district educational councils. Then, I told him that the general question of amending the Madras Elementary Education Act would be taken up and that it would be one of the questions to be considered. It seems to me wrong in principle that a member who is elected by a particular body and who serves as representing that body in another institution should continue to serve in that institution representing the particular object with which he was elected when his term of office in the body electing him has ceased. It is rather anomalous. I would, therefore, ask my hon. friend to consider this aspect of the matter and not to press his amendment."

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—"May I further point out that this amendment will practically have the effect of disenfranchising the members of that body."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—"I do not press it."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 14—cont.

The following amendment was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

124. *Add the following as a separate paragraph :—*

‘The maximum strength of the Senate shall not exceed two hundred and fifty members.’

Clause 14 as amended was then put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 15.

The following amendment was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

125. *Omit the words ‘and shall have the power to review the action of the Syndicate, the Academic Council and the Council of Affiliated Colleges.’*

Clause 15 was put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 16.

Sub-clause (1).

The following amendments were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

125-A. *Before the words ‘to provide’ insert ‘shall hold, control and administer the property and funds of the university.’*

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—

126. *After the word ‘branches’ insert the words ‘and centres.’*

Sub-clause (2).

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I move—

127. *After the word ‘constituent’ insert the words ‘and affiliated.’*

“This is a very simple amendment. Under the sub-clause one of the powers that the Senate shall have is

to encourage co-operation and reciprocity among constituent colleges with a view to promoting academic life.

“I only say that the Senate shall have power to encourage co-operation and reciprocity among affiliated colleges also. If there are two or three colleges in one place, you should also encourage co-operation and reciprocity among them. The amendment does not say that this should be done at once. All that is required is that it may be done if necessary and if it is desirable.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“I second the amendment.”

2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ The hon. Member will see in clause 27, item (f), a provision is made in the powers of the Council of Affiliated Colleges for encouraging such co-operation as follows :

in consultation with the colleges concerned to prepare and lay before the Syndicate plans for the concentration and co-ordination of resources for higher teaching and research and for the promotion of university life at suitable centres outside the limits of the university so as to prepare for the institution of new universities.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ May I point out to the hon. the Minister that it is exactly the reason why this amendment should be accepted. The Council of Affiliated Colleges is mentioned there, but their function is merely to recommend. If any action has to be taken by the Senate, it becomes all the more obligatory on the part of the Senate to have that power in order to exercise it.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ If the House wants it, I do not really want to object to it.”

The amendment was put and carried unanimously.

The following similar amendment, therefore, fell through :—

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANIOLU :—

128. *After the word ‘ constituent ’ insert the words ‘ and affiliated. ’*

Sub-clause (3).

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I move—

129. *After the word ‘ constituent ’ insert the words ‘ and affiliated. ’*

“ This is also a similar amendment and for similar reasons the Senate should have the power in regard to affiliated colleges to do what is contained in sub-clause (3) viz :

to make such provision as will enable constituent colleges to undertake specialization of studies and to organize common laboratories, libraries and other equipment for research work.

“ In a place like Trichinopoly, which may become a university centre, supposing there are a number of colleges able to specialize in certain studies and to organize common laboratories and other equipment, why not the Senate have the power to recognize it and if necessary help these colleges with finance? All that we say is that if affiliated colleges are also in a position to specialize some study as the Bangalore and Mysore colleges, there is no reason why the Senate should not have the power, and we only say that the Senate may be given the power so that at any future time it may be able to recognize such things and if necessary help financially.”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ I second the amendment.”

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—“ It will be noticed that the whole purpose of this clause is an enabling one. From one point of view, there is no harm in making the amendment. But at the same time it must not be forgotten that the case is very different in regard to clause (2) where the Senate is to have power :

to encourage co-operation and reciprocity among constituent and affiliated colleges with a view to promoting academic life.

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

"But here, in this clause (3), we arrive at a somewhat different stage of things altogether according to the principles already accepted by this House. The first object of this Bill is the development of a teaching and residential university in Madras. It is in regard to that development that this clause is specially framed. There are other provisions identical enough to provide for the development of affiliated colleges into university centres or for the recognition of university centres. It seems to me that according to the scheme of the Bill as accepted up to now by the House, the proper place for what my hon. friend proposes is not this clause but some other place. On that ground I oppose the amendment."

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I withdraw my amendment." The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

MR. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI sought the permission of the House to move the next amendment standing in the name of Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar in the absence of the latter, which permission was granted.

MR. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"Sir, I move—

130. *After the words 'constituent colleges' insert the words 'and university centres.'*

"Following the reasons just now given by the Advocate-General, I ask the House that this amendment may be accepted. The hon. the Minister has been good enough to put it in the preamble also that this Bill is to provide for the constitution of future universities, and in order to allay the fears entertained by mufassal colleges, he has been pleased to accept the inclusion of the definition of what are called 'university centres' as proposed by my hon. friend, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar. Now, this amendment is only to extend what will be done for constituent colleges to university centres also if it is possible for the Senate. This sub-clause enables the Senate:

to make such provision as will enable constituent colleges to undertake specialization of studies and to organize common laboratories, libraries and other equipment for research work.

Once we have accepted the principle of university centres, then it stands to reason that we must be able also to provide for these to undertake such sort of specialization and to organize common laboratories and other equipment so that in time to come they may develop into universities. Having accepted the definition of 'university centres', if you do not give power to the Senate to permit these university centres to become real universities, then the mere acceptance of the definition of the words 'university centres' would not help the mufassal colleges in any way. For these reasons, I beg the House to accept this amendment."

RAI SAHIB E. C. M. MASCARENHAS:—"I second it."

REV. DR. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"I think this amendment is in a different category from the one accepted by this House in regard to 'university centres.' The object of this Bill is to establish a local university in Madras. That is one object. The other object is that other places also should have

2nd February 1923] [Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail]

Clause 16—cont.

universities in future, and in order to recognize that fact, the term 'university centre' has been introduced. But, as I take it, the idea of this clause is to specify what is to be done in connexion with this local university that is being established in Madras, and it seems to me that it is going altogether beyond the powers of the Senate to regulate or to make arrangements of this kind in connexion with the university centres. I had no great difficulty in being able to accept the previous amendment. But I fear we shall be going exactly against the object of this Bill if we are to accept this amendment."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I wish to say a few words in support of this amendment. What is the object of this House in having accepted the definition of 'university centres' if it is not possible for something being done for the purpose of helping the formation of future universities? I would submit, Sir, that even according to paragraph 3 in the Preamble one of the objects of this Bill is that :

It is desirable by the concentration and co-ordination of resources for higher teaching and research at suitable centres outside the limits of the university to prepare for the institution of new universities.

"Having that as one of our objects and having also provided for 'university centres', is it, Sir, unreasonable that the Senate should even within the limitations of finance make such provision as is feasible to enable university centres to undertake the specialization of studies and to organize common laboratories, libraries and other equipment? I think, Sir, that when once this House has accepted the position given to university centres with the object of bringing into existence future universities, it will only be reasonable and proper that the Senate should be in a position to make some provision in pursuance of this object. I think the amendment is a reasonable one and deserves to be accepted."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"I wish to say a word, Sir, with reference to what Dr. Macphail said that this Bill was intended to create a university for Madras only. I am sure, Sir . . ."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPFAIL :—"Excuse me, Sir. What I said was 'mainly' and not 'only'."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"If this Bill was *mainly* intended to make a teaching and residential university for Madras, I do not think there would have been any necessity for paragraph 3 of the Preamble and for the hon. the Minister accepting the inclusion of 'university centres'. Surely Dr. Macphail in saying so does not echo the mind of the hon. the Minister or of anybody else in this House. When he accepted the formation of 'university centres', what is the fun of his saying that the university centres shall not be helped by the Senate to undertake specialization of studies? You will recognize them as university centres; but at the same time, will you say : 'Oh, no; no power of that kind should be given to the Senate!'? If the Senate is able to do it in the case of the teaching and residential university at Madras, why not give it the power to provide for such specialized teaching in the university centres also. If this position had not been accepted then, I would have asked the hon. the Minister then alone that the definition of 'university centres' need not be accepted."

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

The motion was put to the House and lost.

Sub-clause (6).

3.15 p.m. Mr. G. VANDANAM:—"Mr. President, I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name—

131. *After sub-clause (6) (a) insert the following as (6) (b):—*

'or are teachers in educational institutions under conditions prescribed and shall have passed the prescribed examinations of the university or.'

"Sir, this clause was to be found in the original draft. The framers must have thought that it was not against the spirit of the Bill. It is stated that the object of this Bill is to foster the development of academic life in the constituent and affiliated colleges. Now, if the teachers do anything, it is this. They are supposed to create and foster academic spirit in the schools in which they are teaching and by appearing privately these teachers do not lose anything which the university may confer on them. As teachers they are supposed to study the subjects very well before they appear for the examinations. So by allowing them to go privately we will not be taking away from them their academic spirit.

"In this Bill there is some sort of provision for exempting a certain class of people. So, I say that these teachers may come under that category or class. Sir, some people might say that it is altogether against the spirit of the Bill to exempt the teachers also. Formerly, when the Madras University was characterized as an examining university, some men who were interested in the well-being of the university said that it was not true, because there were certain lectureships and other things to help the university students. So if an exemption is made in favour of some students the name of the teaching and residential university will not suffer. Since neither the name nor the spirit of the Bill will suffer, I propose that this amendment may be accepted for the benefit of teachers who are helping a large number of students in the Presidency."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I second it."

The Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"Mr. President, Sir, I regret I have to oppose this amendment. I have had a great deal to do with teachers and the teachers all over the Presidency doing very useful work; but I feel that it is really in the interests of the teachers that I should oppose this amendment. What is it that is proposed? It is that teachers who are going to teach the boys in this Presidency are to receive no university education themselves, at least that large numbers of them are to receive no university education. The mover of the amendment has suggested that teachers do a great deal to spread academic spirit in the schools where they teach. Now, Sir, I understand that academic spirit means the spirit of the university. If that is the meaning, how it is possible for men who have not themselves been members of a university to spread the academic spirit in their schools I really fail to understand. The mover also suggested that this was not going contrary to the idea contained in the Bill, where it is stated that its object is to institute a residential and teaching university. I have already expounded what is meant

2nd February 1923] [Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail]

Clause 16—cont.

by the words residential and teaching. If there is one thing that they imply it is this: that the men who get degrees of the Madras University in future will be men who will have to reside either in Madras or in some other academic centre as long as there are other academic centres which are connected with the University of Madras. A teaching university means that it is a university to the admission of which there is attached a condition that students must study in one of the colleges connected with the university. My hon. friend referred to the fact that Madras has hitherto been an examining university. Well, I have long held the view, and I have already expounded it, that since the new constitution came into existence in 1906, the Madras University has not been much of an examining university, but has been a teaching university; and the reason for that opinion of mine is simply this, that since that year we have not had private candidates. All students who appear for the examination, unless they get the special exemption of the Senate on the recommendation of the Syndicate, have been through all the classes of one college or another. In that sense I consider the Madras University as a teaching university. We have not had external students. A few exceptions were made in the case of women, but even this has largely been restricted of late years. Sir, I should, in conclusion, say this. I consider that we would be inflicting an injury upon our schools if we were to encourage men who are going to be the teachers of schools not to come to the university. University education consists not merely in studying certain books and passing certain examinations, but in being well disciplined by young men coming into contact with their fellow young men and getting all the advantages that accrue to young men by intercourse with one another and by the exchange of ideas. It is for these reasons that I am not inclined to support this amendment. I hold very strongly that the benefits which young men obtain from coming to colleges are very largely gained not merely from books, but by intercourse of mind with mind. I think it would be a calamity for us to encourage the future teachers of the Madras University not to come to the university. I know that in many cases it involves a great deal of hardship for men to get a university degree. I know what it is in Scotland. I know also what it is in Madras. In spite of all that, I hold strongly that we would be inflicting an injury both upon the teachers and upon the schools in this Presidency by not encouraging them to come to the university."

MR. G. VANDANAM:—"Sir, in spite of all that has been said, I still press my amendment."

DIWAN BAHADUR R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU:—"Sir, if the House will tolerate a brief statement as regards the history of this amendment, I shall submit that this amendment stood as part of the Bill in the original draft submitted to this House when the Bill was introduced. That has already been pointed out by the hon. mover of this amendment. It was subsequently removed in the Select Committee stage; and without meaning anything personal, I may be permitted to state that it was removed almost entirely in deference to the authority of my esteemed friend, Dr. Macphail. He made an equally vigorous speech there, as whenever he is on his legs he is nothing if not vigorous—which I take as an accomplishment and a virtue which I greatly wish I could acquire—and the amendment was dropped.

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

But even then, there were a few teachers, a superannuated one like myself and one in active service like Mr. Vandanam, who did vote in favour of its retention; but as often happened, in the Select Committee we were overwhelmed. However we thought that there might be some hope in making an appeal to this larger tribunal. If here also we are to be told that one who has not been in the sacred precincts of colleges shall under no circumstance be permitted to be a teacher, then I shall only say, abandon all hope of entering the teaching profession. . . .”

The Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—“ In opposing this amendment, I never suggested anything of the kind. All that I suggested was that no one should get a degree who has not been to the university; and not that he should not become a teacher.”

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“ Well, Sir, I have not the accuracy and vigour of Dr. Macphail, but that was what I meant. No one has a right to obtain a degree, even that degree which, with all respect to my hon. friend, Diwan Bahadur L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar, is *supposed* to be so easy and so numerous, viz., the degree in Philosophy, unless he has received education and resided in a certain definite college. If that is the decision which we are going to arrive upon, then I say we shall be keeping out from the teaching profession a good many that would otherwise be devoted to it as the sacred mission of life and elect that profession.

“ Sir, a good deal has been said about academic life. I yield to none in my appreciation of what is called the academic life. I thought, Sir, every school fostered academic life, though on a miniature scale. Therefore, a teacher who was a member of a school was in an academic atmosphere.

“ It is hardly necessary for me to point out to hon. Members that a school is, in the matter of what is called academic spirit, radically different from any other kind of institutions. Whatever the relative position of a teacher as regards his pay and as regards his rank, in a vast majority of cases he is in daily contact with those who have received the highest education that the university imparts. If in my beloved *alma mater*, the Madras Christian College, there is a teacher who is in charge of the Third Form, I am quite sure that the academic spirit of my hon. friend, Dr. Macphail, will somehow filter down to him also. Therefore, I think he is in the academic atmosphere, though not in that patent form which we think prevails in a college. I wish to emphasize this point, because therein lies the real distinction in the matter of this exemption between a teacher and a person following any other profession. He is doing that which is the most essential part of the business, namely, he is in touch with those who are promoting education, he is maintaining scholastic habits and he is fostering the spirit of culture. Consequently, I say he is in the very midst of the field of academic life which we no doubt very naturally lay stress upon as a prerequisite.

“ Then again, Sir, it has been stated that intercourse of mind with mind is essential. I claim that if a school is worth the name, if a school has any life in it, that is the very vital characteristic of a school, namely, intercourse of mind with mind. It should not be lost sight of that this exemption is

2nd February 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

Clause 16—cont.

claimed only for teachers. Without citing it as an infallible authority, but submitting it as a helpful analogy, may I point out that the Calcutta University has for years been recognizing this as a very desirable practice? I wish to point out that not only from Bengal but from extra territorial regions, teachers have been permitted to appear for the University examinations of the Calcutta University, and they have passed the Intermediate, the B.A., and even the M.A. examination. But the chief point is this: it is said that we are going to inflict upon our schools teachers who have not received this benefit of academic life. If that be the reason for keeping these out, then I believe the fact that they are already teachers ought not to count in their favour, but that they ought to be required to go out because we have already inflicted them upon the schools. They are already teachers; it is not that they are going to become teachers hereafter. They are already in the midst of academic life, and they ought to get the benefit of this special exemption. In all other departments there is special encouragement given to those who pass what are called departmental examinations. I submit that these are the departmental examinations for the Education Department, and every facility ought to be given to the teachers in this direction. With these words, I beg to support this amendment."

MR. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Vandanam, said that women were the only class of students who were supposed to be exempted. I should like to draw the attention of the House to clause 35 (2) under which clause even teachers may be exempted by special order of the Syndicate made on the recommendation of the Academic Council. All that we say is that we should not exempt a whole class of persons like teachers but should give that freedom to the Academic Council and the Syndicate to adjust these matters which are essentially of academic nature. In such matters I do not think it will be proper on the part of this House to make direct recommendations to the Senate or the Syndicate to exempt teachers as a class. I think that power is already conferred upon the Syndicate and the Academic Council to exempt any class of persons not necessarily teachers who cannot for some reason or other be members of a constituent or an affiliated college. I think there is perfect freedom conferred upon the Syndicate and the Academic Council in the matter of giving exemptions if they so choose. I therefore request my hon. friend, Mr. Vandanam, whether he cannot see his way to withdraw this amendment."

MR. M. RATNASWAMI:—"Sir, I want to point out that this amendment is bad both for the students of high schools and for teachers. One of the most pleasant reminiscences of my school life was that of a teacher who was preparing for some University examination. He used to bring his books to the class and get up his subject during the class hours. We had a pleasant time of it when he was engaged in the business of cramming for the University examination. My honest opinion is that if this amendment is accepted it will lead to the neglect of students by the teachers who are allowed to cram for the University examinations. This is also bad from the point of view of teachers, because the kind of preparation that they are apt to make will be the cramming of a few books and notes of lecturers in Madras. I remember this teacher spending a lot of time writing to his friends in Madras to procure notes of college lectures. I am afraid that this

[Mr. M. Ratnaswami]

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

amendment brought forward by my hon. friend, Mr. Vandanam, although it is supposed to be in the interests of teachers, will be distinctly detrimental to the interests of teachers and will reduce the quality of instruction that they will be able to get although they may succeed in getting some degree. With these few observations, I beg to oppose the amendment."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE:—"Sir, the speeches of my hon. friends, Rev. Dr. Macphail and Mr. Ratnaswami, leave me nothing to add. But I just rise to say that I entirely agree with them. From my own experience, I believe that it will be distinctly to the detriment of the teachers and the taught if this amendment is carried. How could we encourage people who are engaged in teaching in schools not to undergo the requisite course of training so that they may turn out into efficient teachers? This is distinctly what we want to do by this amendment, that is, we seek to exempt them from attending a course in a constituent or affiliated college and qualifying themselves for the Arts degree in the subjects in which they are teaching in schools. We want as teachers men who have had a very bright college career and anything that would tend to lower the standard of teaching would be detrimental to the interest of education in this Presidency and also detrimental to the future progress of this country. I therefore strongly oppose this amendment."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, it seems to me, as was pointed out by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, that there is already provision made in clause 35 (2) of the Bill for exemption being granted to non-collegiate students to pass the University examinations and qualify themselves for the degree. A candidate can be exempted from the provisions of clause 35 (i) by a special order of the Syndicate made on the recommendation of the Academic Council. There may be some misgiving that the Academic Council and the Syndicate may not be quite so liberal in the matter as the Senate; that means that the teachers do not trust the members of their own profession. Whether this amendment is accepted or not, it rests entirely in the hands of the members of the teacher's profession who form the Syndicate and the Academic Council to grant this exemption or refuse it. I therefore think that no useful purpose will be served by dividing the House on this question or even by carrying this amendment in this House. Indeed advantage can be taken of the provisions of clause 35 (2). I am against making a general rule for exemption being granted in the case of even scientific subjects which require training in a laboratory, and governing candidates for subjects such as history or philosophy cannot be made so elastic. I think that we really ought to be satisfied with the provisions made already in the Bill, though on their merits I have my own doubts. With these remarks I beg to oppose the amendment."

The amendment was put and lost.

The following amendment was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU:—

132. In sub-clause (6) (b) for the 'semicolon' substitute a 'comma : and add 'or' ,

2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

The following amendment being similar to the amendment No. 131 which was disposed was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—

133. *Add the following as sub-clause 6 (c) :—*

‘ (c) being teachers in educational institutions, shall, under any conditions prescribed therefor, have passed the prescribed examinations of the university.’

Sub-clause 9.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, I beg to move—

134. *After the words ‘ conferred by this Act ’ insert the following :—*

‘ for a period of five years or within such period ’

“ Sir, this amendment is really to emphasize the idea which has been given expression to so often by my hon. friend Rev. Dr. Macphail. The main object of this Bill is to establish a University in Madras. Clause 51 provides that the Senate shall, at the end of five years from the passing of this Act, submit a report to the Local Government on the condition of affiliated colleges and on the desirability or otherwise of establishing other universities outside the limits of the university. During the transition period in order to bring matters to a head at least after the end of five years, I submit that the affiliation to this university of colleges in the mufassal should be frankly recognized to be of a temporary character and that for a period of five years only. The main object of the Bill being the establishment of a university, it does not matter whether it is residential or local, the question of the position of the affiliated colleges will crop up only at the end of five years. I want this sub-clause 9 to be brought in conformity with clause 51 and I therefore suggest that this affiliation is to continue only for a period of five years: so that the question may be brought forward again for legislation at the end of five years. As to what exactly will arise at the end of that period the future alone can decide and we cannot say anything definite on the matter. But I want this principle to be frankly recognized in the Bill. Of course if my hon. friend, the Minister for Education, wants a perfect state of things to be created by this Bill, he will oppose this amendment, but if his idea is that the new University at Madras should cut itself adrift as early as possible as suggested by my hon. friend, Rev. Dr. Macphail, from its affiliated institutions elsewhere, then he cannot do better than by accepting this amendment.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU seconded the amendment.

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—“ Sir, I want to raise this specific question, namely, if the new University does not come into existence within that specific period of five years, what is going to happen for those unfortunate mufassal colleges ? ”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, the Minister for Education for the time being will come forward with a proposal for the extension of the period by another five years by amending this clause.

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

Legislative action will be taken and in that way the whole question of the position of the affiliated colleges will come up for consideration in this Council. That is my only object in moving this amendment."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I think, it is neither a wise nor practical suggestion to introduce that amendment into this clause. We have already discussed this matter and in clause 51, as my hon. friend knows, after a good deal of discussion in the Select Committee, we have put in that :

3-45 p.m.

The Senate shall at the end of five years from the passing of this Act submit a report to the Local Government on the condition of affiliated colleges and on the desirability of establishing other universities outside the limits of the university. The Local Government shall lay the report before the Legislative Council and shall take such action on it as it deems fit.

" This is a suggestion that was made in the Select Committee and was unanimously accepted. In view of clause 51 that is :

the Senate shall at the end of five years from the passing of this Act submit a report to the Local Government on the condition of affiliated colleges and on the desirability or otherwise of establishing other universities . . .

and having given the discretion to the Local Government, to introduce a new clause now saying that all affiliatory functions of the university should cease at the end of five years seems to me to be inconsistent. A question has been asked by the hon. Rev. Dr. Macphail, what is to become of this Act at the end of five years? The hon. mover has replied that at the end of five years the Government have to come before the Legislative Council with an amending enactment. I ask whether it is feasible and practicable. While you have clause 51 which gives the Government power to consider the whole question and lay its report before the Legislative Council and to take such action as it deems fit, it seems to be impracticable that another measure should be brought forward before the end of five years. I do realize and I do recognize my hon. friend's feelings in the matter, but we must consider as practical men, as business men, whether at the end of five years any attempt will be made. It cannot be that universities will be started all over the Presidency at the end of five years and that all affiliation will cease at the end of that period. Therefore, this suggestion seems to be impracticable under the existing conditions; and in view of what we have in section 51, I hope and trust that my hon. friend will see his way to withdraw his amendment."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" An appeal has been made by the hon. the Minister for Education, on the practical side of this question. As a man with practical ideals in these things I heartily support this amendment. The view I want to present to the House is this: we have a fair idea of our finance, we know how the Madras University is being furnished with funds. When the Andhra University Committee was appointed, we thought that a practical move would be made in the direction, but for some reason or other the question was not thoroughly examined. Suddenly this reorganization of the Madras University—which put into practical politics means of putting more burden on the finances of the province in the reorganization of the colleges at Madras and spending the finances of the provinces only for the benefit of the Madras colleges—was sprung upon

2nd February 1923] [Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

Clause 16—cont.

us. The view that is constantly presented to this House is that we should have this question examined by the Council at the end of five years. The practical effect of this amendment will be that it will be necessary for the hon. the Minister for Education to come forward with his practical ideas as to what he intends to do regarding the affiliated colleges, whether he wants to continue the state of things as contemplated under this Bill or whether he wants separate universities altogether. These questions are questions which a future Council will have to decide. Of course, it has been pointed out that at the end of five years a report will be submitted to the Government and it will be examined by them. Suppose the Government examines the report and keeps it aside."

The Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"It is going to be laid before the Legislative Council."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"The laying of a report before the Legislative Council does not by itself mean the removing of an existing defect. We have so many reports laid before the Legislative Council, but the Government are not able to give effect to these reports and remedy the existing defects. We know a number of affiliated colleges will come into existence owing to the introduction of this measure, and the hon. the Minister must either be willing to continue the existing state of things in them, or offer remedies. That is the question he will have to tackle, and it is the practical side of the whole question. I hope the hon. the Minister for Education will see that point."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR:—"Sir, I do not expect, speaking for myself, that the observations I am making in supporting this amendment will in any way influence either the hon. the Minister or the party in power."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"On a point of order, Sir, I do think that it is a reflection on us to say that no argument of the hon. Member will have any influence on us."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Conceivably the hon. Member may feel that his arguments are very weak" (laughter).

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR:—"If I may say so, Sir, I perfectly agree with you, because there are some arguments that will not appeal to the party in power, and my arguments are of that nature. Therefore my arguments are undoubtedly weak. But I do wish that my views on the present motion should also be placed before the House before a vote is taken upon it. The House will notice that there are a number of provisions in the Bill which show that there are possibilities of improvement, possibilities of working in various directions by which not merely the idea of a residential and teaching university will become an accomplished fact, but also similar universities will come into existence elsewhere; but when any attempt is made to come into close quarters with that idea so as to lay an obligation on those on whom the responsibility will rest of working out the provisions of this Bill and of realizing the effects that this Bill is intended to produce, we find a considerable amount of shyness on the part of those who are responsible for this measure to shoulder these obligations. Now, Sir, this amendment which my hon. friend proposes is merely a request that for five

[Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

years those affiliated colleges may continue to be affiliated, and that subsequent to that period there should be a duty cast upon the Government themselves in working this Act to see how long they have to continue to be affiliated and that on that matter the Legislative Council should be consulted. That is exactly the significance of this amendment, and what we want is that as far as possible this matter should come before the Legislative Council. The difference between my hon. friend's amendment and clause 51 consists in this: that whereas the amendment necessitates the matter coming up before the Legislative Council after a period of the five years referred to, clause 51 merely says 'that there shall be an application to the Senate for a report by the Senate to the Local Government'. What exactly the Local Government has to do upon that does not appear from the existing provision of the Bill. What is wanted is not merely to be satisfied with the report that will be placed before the Legislative Council but the taking of the legislative action for which the local Government shall be responsible. It is only for that purpose, and as a matter of fact it is more in consonance with the spirit of clause 51 and in consonance with the desire of those who want that this university should be converted into a teaching and residential university that this amendment should be accepted."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I have nothing to add to what I have already stated except this: that we do feel from what we have heard from the speeches in this Council that the position of affiliated colleges under this Bill will be unsatisfactory. We want to appeal to the Minister and through him to the Legislative Council to undertake a review of this question which will satisfy us. We do feel that the new measure incorporated in this Bill is fully unsatisfactory so far as the Council of affiliated colleges is concerned. Of course, the Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail, who is an experienced educationist in this Presidency, has informed us that the essential thing is to create a university in Madras as early as possible as foreshadowed in this Bill and that the subsequent question with reference to affiliated colleges must be decided on the developments that must inevitably follow on the reorganization for which provision is made in this Bill. The Council of Affiliated Colleges, according to the Bill, is very unsatisfactory. No powers of any vital character have been assigned to it. It is to have no funds and no executive and under these circumstances to say that the Council of Affiliated Colleges is a machinery which will satisfy the educational needs of a large number of mufassal colleges and that the old state of things will be perpetuated without time limit is a thing which I for one and other hon. Members who are interested in education as a whole cannot understand. Therefore I should like to know what the practical defects are in giving effect to this amendment which provides that the Government should come to the Legislative Council even within a period of five years. If things are unsatisfactory, should we not be allowed to ask for a further extension of five, or three or two years.

"My hon. friend, Mr. Patro, referred to clause 51. What that clause says is that a report should be submitted to the local Government and they should lay that report before the Legislative Council. So far as the Government is concerned, it has to take such action as it may deem fit. Many of the measures of the local Government which it deems fit to be given effect to

2nd February 1923] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Clause 16—cont.

are to be simply recorded without further action owing to want of finance and other causes. What we do want is to compel consideration of this question at the end of five years. On a consideration of the statements that have been made as regards the urgency of the University Reform, on its face value, it seems to me desirable if hon. Members had frankly recognized that the position of affiliated colleges must come up for consideration again.

"I do not think I can add anything further. As regards the power of persuasiveness of my hon. friends sitting opposite, I am sure we are not able to persuade either the hon. the Minister or Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar as Dr. Oosman did with the twinkling of an eye regarding the question of representation of the Corporation of Madras. We need strong arguments, but the hon. Members opposite seem to be so persuasive that no arguments are required."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"The hon. Members of this House will see that the Leader of the Opposition made a very short speech."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"That is exactly what I said. My friends are persuaded by short speeches, and sometimes without any speeches (laughter). Certainly the persuasive power of other hon. Members is much greater than ours."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

The following amendment was not moved :—

Sub-clause (11).

A p.m. Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

135. *Add at the end the following :—*

'and also to declare, constitute and recognize any affiliated college as a constituent college;'

New sub-clause (12).

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"With your permission, Sir, I want to insert a new sub-clause as sub-clause (10) after sub-clause (9). As I have not given notice of it, I want your permission, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"We have already passed over sub-clause (11) and we cannot go back."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"Then I shall put it as new sub-clause (12), Sir. My amendment is this—

'to make recommendations to the local Government for the recognition of the 'areas' as 'university centres'.

"Have I your permission to move it, Sir?"

The necessary permission having been given, Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu continued :—

"This is a mere consequential amendment, Sir. We have already accepted the definition of 'university centre' and that involves this process of the university recommending to Government certain local areas as university

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

centres. And since we are here defining the powers of the university on the Senate, I think it will be in place to have an amendment of this kind."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR seconded the amendment.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"There is no objection to have that amendment, Sir."

The motion was put and carried.

Sub-clause (13).

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, Mr. President, I beg to move the following amendment to clause 16, sub-clause (13):—

136. *Before the words 'to supervise and control' insert 'to make regulations regarding the admission of students to the university'.*

"Sir, according to a resolution of this Council, Government appointed committees to regulate admission of students to the various Government colleges. Now that all these colleges are to be handed over to the university, the Government will have no control over them, and I have fears, Sir, that these committees may cease to exist. Of the two authorities of this university, the Senate and the Syndicate, I have more confidence in the Senate and so I want this power to be given to the Senate. This is of vital importance to the school-going population of non-Brahmans, and let me see, Sir, if I can persuade the hon. the Minister to have this secured."

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI seconded the amendment.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, there seems to be some misapprehension in the mind of my friend, Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar, in regard to the admission of students. Students of private colleges are admitted by the College authorities under regulations framed by them. In the case of Government colleges, selection committees are appointed and admission into these Colleges are regulated by these committees. As regards private or other constituent colleges, they have their own rights over the admission of students and over their internal management. The university has no control. Therefore, I should ask my friend, Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar, if he can see his way to withdraw the amendment."

Rev. W. MESTON :—"May I point out, Sir, that in clause 24 (f) this power belongs to the Academic Council?"

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"After the assurance given by the hon. the Minister that these selection committees will continue, I shall withdraw my amendment."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The following amendment was not moved :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

137. *After the word 'university' insert the words 'and of the constituent and affiliated colleges.'*

2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

New sub-clause after sub-clause (19).

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—“ Sir, I beg to move the following amendment :—

137-A. (i) *Insert the following as sub-clause (20) :—*

‘ To make Statutes regulating the method of election to the authorities of the university and the procedure at meeting of the Senate, Syndicate and other authorities of the university and the quorum of members required for the transaction of business by them.’

(ii) *Re-number the subsequent sub-clauses.*

“ Sir, I think this may be inserted and I hope the hon. the Minister will accept it. I do not think any speech is necessary to commend the acceptance of this amendment. If the hon. the Minister thinks that it is necessary, let him have it, otherwise let him chuck it, up.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHEITIYAR seconded the amendment.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, this amendment relates to the fixing of the quorum in the various authorities of the university. My friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, has given notice of some amendments with regard to this. So, in order to consolidate all that, power is given to the Senate to fix a quorum in regard to the meetings relating to the various authorities. I will, therefore, accept this amendment.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I have given notice of similar amendments, Sir. I think the hon. Member feared to have to accept my amendments and probably that is the reason why he wanted to accept the amendment of Mr. Usman Sahib.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ The difference between the two amendments is this, Sir, that whereas my friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, has given amendments fixing the number to form the quorum in the case of each of these authorities according to the amendment of Mr. Usman Sahib, a general power is given to the Senate to fix the number and not to fix it in the Statute itself.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Shall I explain the difficulty that I feel about this particular amendment, Sir? If hon. Members will look up to some of the recent Statutes passed by the Government of India, viz., the Aligarh University Act and the Benares University Act, they will see that the quorum is specially laid down in the first Statutes. The reason is obvious, because the newly-constituted bodies have to meet and for purposes of conducting their own proceedings the quorum is laid down in the first Statutes. In some other Statutes with which we are also familiar, viz., the Local Boards Act and the Municipalities Act, the quorum is always a matter, not so much for the rules, as far the original sections. So, wherever it is, whether in the rules or in the original enactment, the quorum should be fixed so that the newly-constituted bodies can proceed to function immediately. That was the reason why, Sir, that my amendments took this form. I do not see the difficulty of my friend in considering my amendments, but now that the amendment of Mr. Usman Sahib has been

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

accepted, I do not wish to say anything further. It is a policy of the Legislature, as you are well aware, Sir, to settle the quorum and lay it down in the Statute itself. Those were the considerations, Sir, that led me to frame my amendments in the way I have done on the analogy of some of the sections of those University Acts."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I point out, Sir, that the hon. Member's amendments will come in the Act only ? "

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I know that. All that I say is that it must find a place either in the Act or in the first Statute. But as the hon. the Minister is agreeable to the present amendment, I have no quarrel with that."

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—" I may point out, Sir, that the amendment of Mr. Usman Sahib is proposed to be made in the Statute."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" My difficulty is, the Senate is to make the Statutes and the Senate should have a quorum by law, and what should be the strength of the Senate which should pass these Statutes must be available. Therefore, it must find a place either in the first rules or in the Act itself, and between the two I prefer the Act. But I have no objection, Sir, if it is in the first Statutes."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I am satisfied, Sir, because the quorum for meetings of the Senate is to be fixed in the first Statutes."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" My hon. friend now recognizes my point, Sir. He says he will put it in the first Statutes. Now it is not there, and that is exactly my point."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" It would have come if only my hon. friend had waited."

The amendment was then put and carried.

The following amendments were not moved :—

Sub-clause (21).

Srivan BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—

137-B. *After the words 'acts and things' insert the words 'and spend such amount of money.'*

New sub-clauses after sub-clause (21).

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

138. *Add the following as sub-clause (22) :—*

'(22) shall hold, control and administer the property and funds of the university through a Standing Committee consisting of seventeen persons elected from among themselves in accordance with rules prescribed in this behalf by the Chancellor.'

2nd February 1923]

Clause 16—cont.

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

139. *Add the following as sub-clause 23 :—*

‘ (23) shall administer all funds placed at the disposal of the university for specific purposes through the Committee constituted under clause 22.’

Last paragraph.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

140. *Omit this paragraph.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

141. *Omit this paragraph.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

142. *Omit this paragraph.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

143. *Add at the end the following :—*

‘ But the Senate may on the recommendation of the Syndicate call any affiliated college a university centre and confer on it all or any of the rights of the constituent college.’

Clause 16, as amended, was then put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 17.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I move—

4-15 p.m.

144. (i) *Insert the following as sub-clause (2) :—*

‘ (2) Thirty-five members of the Senate shall be the quorum for the meeting of the Senate.’

(ii) *Re-number the existing sub-clause (2).*

“ I have already given my reasons, Sir. I understand that my hon. friend will accept this amendment.”

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAYA AYYAR seconded the amendment.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I accept it.”

The amendment was put and carried.

The following amendment of Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu was not moved :—

145. *For ‘ 35 ’ substitute ‘ 25 ’.*

Clause 17 as amended was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 18.

The following amendments were not moved :—

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

146. *In item (1) for the word ‘ eight ’ substitute ‘ eleven ’.*

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 18—cont.

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

147. *In item (1) for the word 'eight' substitute the word 'ten'.*

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

148. *In item (2) for the word 'three' substitute the word 'two'.*

Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR :—

149. *For item (3) substitute the following :—*

'(3) Six members, three being elected by each of the two Councils of Affiliated Colleges from among their members.'

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

150. *In item (3) for the word 'three' substitute 'two'.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

151. *Omit item (4).*

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—

151-A. *Omit item (4).*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

152. *In item (4) for the word 'three' substitute the word 'two'.*

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

152-A. *Add as item (5) the following :—*

'provided that two-thirds of the strength of the Syndicate shall always be non-Brahmans'.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I move—

153. *Number the existing clause as 18 (a) and add the following as 18 (b) :—*

'18 (b) Six members of the Syndicate shall be the quorum for the meeting of the Syndicate'.

"Six, I think, is quite enough."

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—"May I point out that under the amendment already carried the fixing of the quorum for the various bodies apart from the Senate is to be provided in the Statute?"

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Clause 18 was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 19.

The following amendments were not moved :—

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

154. *Omit this sub-clause.*

Sub-clause (c).

Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR :—

155. *Add the following at the end :—*

'and the Councils of Affiliated Colleges'.

2nd February 1923]

Clause 19—cont.

Sub-clause (e).

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

156. *Omit this sub-clause.*

Sub-clause (f).

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

157. *After the word 'emoluments' insert the words 'within the limits sanctioned by the Standing Committee mentioned in section 16, clause 22'.*

Sub-clause (k).

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—

157-A. *Add at the end the following :—
'for consideration'.*

Clause 19 was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 20 was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 21.

The following amendment was not moved :—

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

158. *For the word 'Syndicate' substitute the words 'the Standing Committee of the Senate'.*

Clause 21 was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 22 was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 23.

Class II.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"Although I am aware Sir,—to appropriate your characteristic, suggestive and happy language—that for want of sufficient persuasiveness I have to roll only a Sisyphus stone in all my endeavours in respect of amendment after amendment, yet I shall once again apply myself to that task. I move—

159. *For item (4) substitute the following :—*

'(4) one member of the teaching staff of each of the affiliated first-grade colleges to be elected by that staff'.

"Hon. Members, if they turn to sub-clause 2, will notice, Sir, that to the staff of each constituent college is given the privilege of electing three members to the Academic Council."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I may perhaps facilitate my hon. friend if I indicate that I am prepared to accept the amendment."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"I am thankful, Sir, that the Minister is prepared to accept the amendment, and therefore I shall not inflict a speech on the House in support of my amendment. It has been

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 23—cont.

asked what is to become of the second-grade colleges. But the fact is that there is but one second-grade college in the constituent area, and thus it will have representation. The first-grade colleges only need this privilege, for after all only with reference to the special subjects of studies these representatives are required. I wish therefore to retain the first-grade colleges."

Rev. Dr. W. MESTON seconded the amendment.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" There is one difficulty, Sir, in this amendment being accepted. As the position stands, provision has been made for the appointment of ten members of the Council of Affiliated Colleges to be elected by the said Council including first and second grade colleges. That is in the Bill as amended by the Select Committee. I can understand important privileges being given to the staff of the first-grade colleges in addition to those given to the staff of the second-grade colleges. But to give the privilege of electing members of the Council only to the staff of first-grade colleges is certainly undesirable and unreasonable. I do not know if any provision is made at all to the teachers of the second-grade colleges. I do not find sufficient justification for taking away the privilege from the second-grade colleges."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—" These are five members of the second-grade colleges."

The amendment was put and carried.

The following amendments were not moved :—

Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAH :—

160. *In item (4) for the word 'Council' wherever it occurs substitute 'Councils'.*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

161. *Before the word 'Members' at the beginning insert the following :—*

'The manner of voting for the election of members to be elected under (1), (2), (3) and (4) of class II shall be provided for in the Statutes.'

New sub-clause.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

162. *Add the following as sub-clause (iv) :—*

'Ten members of the Academic Council shall form the quorum for the meetings of the Academic Council.'

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—" I beg to move—

162-A. *Add at the end of the clause the following as a proviso :—*

'Provided that no acts or proceedings of the first Academic Council constituted after the passing of this Act shall be deemed to be invalid by reason only of non-compliance with the provisions of sub-clauses (3) and (4) of class II above.'

2nd February 1923] [Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

Clause 23—cont.

"It is in order to make it clear that though the election by the Senate and by the Council of Affiliated Colleges could not take place owing to these bodies not being in existence that this is moved."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I second it."

The addition of the proviso was put and carried.

Clause 23 as amended was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 24.

The following amendment was not moved :—

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

163. *Omit the words 'to make regulations regarding the admission of students to the university'.*

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"I beg to move the following amendment :—

164. (i) *Insert the following as sub-clause (h) :—*

'to make regulations relating to the conditions on which a university college may be recognized'.

(ii) *Re-letter the subsequent sub-clauses.*

But with your permission, Sir, and the permission of the Council I should like to make this slight alteration :

'To make regulations relating to the recommendation to be made to local Government for recognition of a local area as a university centre, etc.'

"A university centre has to be recognized by the Local Government on the recommendation of the Senate. But what points which Senate will have to bear in mind in making this recommendation will have to be indicated by the proper authority, viz., the Academic Council. That is the point, Sir, which I wish to make clear. There is no doubt that the Senate will recommend; but on what grounds the recommendations are to be made would, I believe, be most properly determined by the regulations that the Academic Council might make."

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I second the amendment."

MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—"What the hon. Member desires to do is to enable the Academic Council to make recommendations regarding the manner of recommendations to the Local Government to recognize places as university centres. That power would normally exist and it is not necessary to have any regulations for the purpose of making the possible recommendations. If it is a power directly to be exercised I can understand."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"Sir, if the hon. the Advocate-General does not find any special reasons why any special power should not be given I should rather suggest that this power may be indicated here, because subsequently there may be some difficulty over that. Unless

[Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 24—cont.

there is any harm likely to be caused by the retention of it, it is perhaps best that we have it. It is necessary not merely to give power to the Academic Council to act but also to indicate the terms in which the first meeting has to act and the making of the regulations will be an important function for them to discharge. I would, therefore, suggest that it should be retained simply because it comes under the purview of the Academic Council."

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General):—"Mr. President, Sir hon. Members will notice that clause 24 (a) gives the function of advising the Syndicate on all academic matters through the Academic Council.

"The question of the recognition of various local areas as university centres is one pertaining to the Local Government. The Local Government is in touch with the Senate and also with the Syndicate. The function of advising the Syndicate on Academic matters devolves on Academic Council. Therefore, all that I say is that to carry out the object the hon. Member has in view, it is not necessary that it should be reduplicated in the proposed amendment."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"If I understand the hon. the Advocate-General aright, he seems to think that it
4-30 p.m. would be unnecessary to have a specific addition of this kind in view of some general provision under sub-clause (a). Well, Sir, I find that sub-clause (a) says 'to advise the Syndicate on all academic matters', whereas this is something which goes even beyond the Syndicate, namely, the Senate. It is the Senate that is finally to make the recommendation. Then again, if we said that all academic matters on which the Academic Council had to make recommendations are covered by (a), why should this provision be made in the Bill, namely, 'to make regulations relating to courses, examinations and the conditions on which students of Affiliated Colleges shall be admitted to examinations for the degrees of the university'—sub-clause (g)? It is purely an academic matter. Nevertheless, it is thought necessary to have an explicit provision. Similarly I say it would be helpful for the object in view to have a specific provision to the effect 'to make regulations relating to the recommendation to the Government for the recognition of local areas as university centres'."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Sir, I beg to resist this amendment on two grounds. One is that the Academic Council is purely an academic body. Its chief function is to make regulations relating to courses, examinations and so on. The recommendation as to university centres involves much larger issues. Secondly, is the procedure one which is liable to be treated under general rules? Do you mean to say that we should pass a general rule and every little thing which conforms to that should be recommended to the Government? It is a novel procedure. It will be dealt with as each case arises. So far as I can see, it is likely that there may be one University centre in the South and another in the North and that is the regulation that is to be made for these? The procedure is one of individual solution."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"If I have been able to follow my hon. friend the Learned Member for the university, he says that there are two objections to my amendment. One is that the Academic

2nd February 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

Clause 24—cont.

Council is concerned with matters academic, whereas the procedure regarding a university centre involves other questions also. I have not the slightest hesitation to admit that, provided I may be permitted to state that to the extent to which the decision of that subject depends upon academical matters, the Academic Council will give its suggestions. The chief point to be decided—the chief point, I do not say the sole point—in recommending any local area as a university centre will be this; namely, whether that local area with the existing college or colleges in it can satisfy the academic requirements of a university centre. The conditions as to ways and means, funds and other things of that kind, the Government may decide. Therefore, the fundamental point is the academic capacity of the local area to be recommended for a university centre, and consequently, the consideration comes legitimately within the purview of the functions of the Academic Council.

“As for the second objection, that there are individual cases to be treated according to their individual peculiarities, I hope that these individual cases do not mean idiosyncracies—cases that do not come under reclassification. It really means individual cases judged on certain general principles with necessary modifications. Therefore, I do not see any reason why these two objections should be considered as completely putting out of court my amendment.”

The amendment was put and lost.

The following amendments were not moved :—

Sub-clause (h).

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

165. *After the word ‘Commerce’ insert the word ‘Industries’.*

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—

165-A. *After the word ‘Commerce’ insert the words ‘Ship-Building and Navigation’.*

Sub-clause (j).

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

166. *Add the following at the end :—*

‘On which teachers in Constituent or Affiliated Colleges may be appointed as university teachers or on which students of constituent or affiliated colleges may attend the lectures delivered by university teachers.’

Proviso.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

167. *After ‘clauses (c), (e)’, insert ‘(f)’.*

Clause 24 was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 25.

The following amendments were not moved :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

168. *After the word ‘Commerce’, insert the word ‘Industries’.*

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 25—cont.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—

168-A. *After the word 'Commerce' insert the words 'Ship-Building and Navigation'*

Clause 25 was put and carried and added to the Bill.

Clause 26.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I beg to move—

169. *For this clause substitute the following :—*

- "26 (1) The Council of Affiliated Colleges shall consist in addition to the Vice-Chancellor of the following :—
- (i) the principals of the affiliated first-grade colleges ;
 - (ii) five principals of the second-grade colleges elected by the principals of such colleges ;
 - (iii) one member of each district elected by the members of the district board and the municipalities of that district ;
 - (iv) representatives for every affiliated first-grade college, one being elected by the teachers of each of such colleges ;
 - (v) ten persons nominated by the Chancellor ; and
 - (vi) not more than ten teachers of the university to be appointed by the Academic Council.
- (2) Members other than ex-officio members shall hold office for a period of three years, provided that persons appointed or elected as representatives of any particular body shall hold office within the said period only so long as they continue to be members of that body.
- (3) The manner of voting for the election of members to the Council under (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) shall be provided for in the Statutes."

" Sir, this is practically one of the Statutes—Statute IV and I wish that it should be provided here. I suggest that the present clause 26 should be replaced by this Statute for this reason, namely, to secure a certain amount of symmetry in the Bill.

" As regards sub-clause (3) in the amendment, I wish to bring to the notice of the Advocate-General and the hon. the Minister what I consider to be a very serious defect in the Bill as regards the authority which will make Regulations or Statutes for election of members. Hon. Members will see that the transitory provision embodied in clause 47 (5), Chapter X, provides that during the period of transition, the Vice-Chancellor should draft such Statutes, Ordinances and Regulations as may be necessary and submit them to the respective authorities competent to deal with them for their disposal. This, as hon. Members of the Select Committee would remember was inserted at the suggestion of Dr. Macphail, that during the period of transition the Vice-Chancellor should submit these drafts for bringing all the new authorities into existence to these authorities of the present university who would be competent to deal with those Statutes, Ordinances and Regulations."

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE MADRAS 1629
UNIVERSITY, 1922

2nd February 1923]

Clause 26—cont.

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I point out, Sir, that the amendment of Muhammad Usman Sahib accepted this afternoon provides for this. The amendment is

to make Statutes regulating the method of election to the authorities of the university and the procedure at meetings of the Senate, Syndicate and other authorities of the university and the quorum of members required for the transaction of business by them.

so that this sub-clause (3) in this amendment is unnecessary."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I recognize the point. I therefore withdraw this sub-clause (3)."

Sub-clause (3) of the amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I accept the first two clauses of the amendment."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Before the amendment is put to the vote, I want to point out a difficulty in the matter. Clause 26 as it stands in the Bill provides also for

such other authorities as may be declared by the Statutes to be authorities of the university.

If we now accept the present amendment, then this portion will be lost."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" I want to state that the point suggested by my hon. friend Mr. Narasimha Raju Garu perhaps would practically be met by the amendment of which I have given notice—amendment No. 189."

Clauses (1) and (2) of amendment (No. 169) were put and carried.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I now beg leave to move the alternative amendment, namely—

For this clause (26) substitute the following :—

‘ 26. (1) The constitution of the Council of Affiliated Colleges and the manner of voting for the election of members to such council shall be provided for in the Statutes.

(2) At any time after the commencement of this Act the Chancellor may on the recommendation of the Senate direct that the Council of Affiliated Colleges be dissolved and that in its place two or more Councils of Affiliated Colleges for different groups of districts be established. The constitution of such councils shall be provided for by the Statutes’."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, he can move this only if the other amendment is not carried."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Yes, sub-clause (3) of the previous amendment was not carried. My original idea was that it was not likely that my first amendment, i.e., for the substitution of Statute IV in the place of clause 26, might not be accepted. My present intention is, as it has now become part of the Act, to have the other idea embodied in the Act, as I explained in my dissenting note, namely, that the Senate after

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [2nd February 1923]

Clause 26—cont.

the constitution of the Council of Affiliated Colleges should have the power of dissolving it and that in its place two or more Councils should be constituted, and also that this should form part of the very same section."

The alternative amendment was not allowed to be moved.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

4-45 p.m. 170. *For this clause substitute the following :—*

' 26 (1) There shall be two councils of Affiliated Colleges, one for the Telugu districts and one for the rest of the Presidency.

(2) The constitution of the Council of Affiliated Colleges and of such other authorities as may be declared by the statutes to be authorities of the university shall be provided for in the manner prescribed.'

"Sir, as far as the second portion is concerned, I cannot move it because it is covered by Statute No. IV. As regards the first portion, it is included in the amendment No. 174 below, which my friend Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar is going to move. Therefore I do not propose to move this amendment."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The following amendments were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

171. *For this clause substitute the following (existing Statute IV of Schedule I) :—*

' 26 (1) The Council of Affiliated Colleges shall consist in addition to the Vice-Chancellor of the following :—

- (i) the principals of affiliated first-grade colleges ;
- (ii) five principals of second-grade colleges elected by the principals of such colleges ;
- (iii) one member for each district elected by the members of the district board and the municipalities of that district ;
- (iv) representatives of the teachers of affiliated first-grade colleges, one being elected by the teachers of each of the colleges ;
- (v) ten persons nominated by the Chancellor ; and
- (vi) not more than ten teachers of the university to be appointed by the Academic Council.

(2) Members other than ex officio members shall hold office for a period of three years, provided that persons appointed or elected as representatives of any particular body shall hold office so long only within the said period as they continue to be members of that body.'

2nd February 1923]

Clause 26—cont.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—

172. *For this clause substitute the following (existing Statute IV of Schedule I) :—*

- ‘ 26 (1) The Council of Affiliated Colleges shall consist in addition to the Vice-Chancellor of the following :—
- (i) the principals of affiliated first-grade colleges ;
 - (ii) five principals of second-grade colleges elected by the principals of such colleges ;
 - (iii) one member for each district elected by the members of the district board and the municipalities of that district ;
 - (iv) representatives of the teachers of affiliated first-grade colleges, one being elected by the teachers of each of the colleges ;
 - (v) ten persons nominated by the Chancellor ; and
 - (vi) not more than ten teachers of the university to be appointed by the Academic Council.
- (2) Members other than ex officio members shall hold office for a period of three years, provided that persons appointed or elected as representatives of any particular body shall hold office so long only within the said period as they continue to be members of that body.’

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA :—

172-A. *For this clause substitute the following :—*

- ‘ 26 (1) There shall be two Councils of Affiliated Colleges, one for the Andhra districts of the Presidency and another for all the other districts in the Presidency.
- (2) Each of the Councils of Affiliated Colleges shall besides the Vice-Chancellor consist of—
- (a) the principals of the affiliated first-grade colleges within its jurisdiction,
 - (b) three principals of the second-grade colleges, elected by the principals of the second-grade colleges within its jurisdiction,
 - (c) the principals of all the teaching colleges within its jurisdiction, if any,
 - (d) one member of each district, within its jurisdiction entitled to vote as provided in section 14 supra and elected by the district boards and the municipalities,
 - (e) three teachers of affiliated first-grade colleges, elected by the teachers of the first-grade colleges, within its jurisdiction from among themselves,
 - (f) one member to be elected by the Telugu Academy in the case of the Council for the Andhra districts and by the Tamil Sangam in the case of the Council for the other districts,
 - (g) one member to be elected by the institution for the Oriental Titles Examination within its jurisdiction, if any, that may be affiliated to the university,

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 26—cont.

- (h) five persons to be nominated by the Chancellor,
- (i) not more than five teachers of the University to be nominated by the Academic Council.
- (3) Members other than ex officio members shall hold office for three years provided that persons appointed or elected as representatives of any particular body shall hold office so long only within the period as they continue to be members of that body or so long only as that body enjoys the privilege of election.'

Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR :—

173. *For the words 'the Council' substitute the words 'the two Councils'.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

174. *Add the following as a separate paragraph :—*

'The Senate may on the recommendation of the Syndicate increase the number of Councils of Affiliated Colleges and prescribe their jurisdictions and the provisions of this Act relating to the Council of Affiliated Colleges shall as far as possible apply to every one of the councils so formed.'

"Sir, this is only a compromise. I saw from the minutes of dissent that there was large volume of opinion that there should be two Councils, one for the North and another for the South. This amendment gives power to the Senate to increase the number of the Council of Affiliated Colleges, if necessary at any time, to two. First of all, the point has to be examined by the Syndicate, and if the Syndicate comes to the conclusion that the work of the various Affiliated colleges is not satisfactorily done by one Council, and if it recommends that it should be increased, then the Senate has got the power to increase that number. It only obviates the necessity of another amendment to the law, and of coming to the legislature again. One set of members have agreed to this sort of compromise. I pray that the hon. the Minister for Education will accept it, because it gives power only as to future action."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU seconded.

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"I don't see how it is proposed to constitute the Councils. It is said that if this is done it would not be necessary to go back to the legislature. I should like to know how chapter IV, clause 18, sub-clause 3, will work. It says 'Three members elected by the Council of Affiliated Colleges from among its members'. How are you going to divide the three members between two Councils?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"My amendment says :

And the provisions of this Act relating to the Council of Affiliated Colleges shall as far as possible apply to every one of the Councils so formed.

"It applies to every one of the Councils, so each will have three."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"May I draw Dr. Macphail's attention to the amendment standing in my name at page 16 (amendment No. 169) where I have suggested a solution for the difficulty?"

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"May I point out that the hon. Member's amendment is not now under discussion?"

2nd February 1923]

Clause 26—cont.

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" I am afraid that objection should prevail unless you speak on the amendment of Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I am only pointing out the difficulty which Dr. Macphail suggested as to what the constitution of these councils should be and whether it is necessary to come to the legislature again. I was only saying how that difficulty could be met. I provide for this in the following words: 'The constitution of such councils shall be provided for by the Statutes.'"

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—" Is that proposed as an amendment to the Bill. I do not see the relevancy of what Mr. Ramachandra Rao is saying. If this amendment is going to be put into the Bill"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Many other supplementary amendments will have to be brought in. This is one. If this amendment is accepted, the necessary consequential amendments will have to be brought in. That is, if the amendment of Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar is accepted, the amendment on page 16 of the agenda will have to be put in. The difficulty is not insuperable."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I think the amendment is one which deserves to be rejected for the simple reason that we are legislating during 1923 for developments which are likely to come five or six years hence. If the future course of events makes it absolutely necessary for this Council of Affiliated Colleges to split up into various divisional councils, that will be the fit time to introduce the necessary amendments. It seems we are only creating a confusion by constituting a council and immediately thinking of what should be done if it were broken up into several councils."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I have to say a few words, in reply to Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. He asked why we should now legislate about something that may develop five or six years hence. After all, we may find it not necessary to wait for five or six years. There is a large body of mufassal opinion that the necessity has already arisen regarding the constitution of two Councils of the Affiliated Colleges. I can only say that the Syndicate may go into this question next year or two years hence. Therefore, there is no necessity to wait long. This is only a compromise between two sets of opinions. My amendment is very reasonable and I put it for the acceptance of the House."

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

A poll having been demanded by Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu, the House divided as follows :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 6. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 2. " L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar. | 7. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimbacharlu. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 8. Sriman Sasibhushan Rath Mahasayo. |
| 4. " C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. | 9. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 5. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 10. Mr. M. Suryanarayana. |
| | 11. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| | 12. Rao Bahadur T. Namberumal Chettiyar. |

[2nd February 1923]

Clause 26—cont.

Noes.

1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.
2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.
3. " the Raja of Panagal.
4. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkatareddi Nayudu.
5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.
6. Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar.
7. " A. Y. G. Campbell.
8. The Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail.
9. Mr. R. G. Grieve.
10. Rao Bahadur K. Ramunni Menon.
11. Mr. E. F. Thomas.
12. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.
13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
14. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.
15. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi.
16. " M. Appalarasayya Nayudu.
17. " R. Appaswami Nayudu.
18. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.
19. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu.
20. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
21. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu.
22. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar.
23. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.
24. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
25. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi.
26. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai.
27. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
28. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya.
29. Mr. J. Kuppuswami.
30. " B. Muniswami Nayudu.
31. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.
32. " M. Narayanaswami Reddi.
33. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
34. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
35. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.
36. Mr. W. P. A. Saundarapandiya Nadar.
37. " R. K. Shanmukhaswami Chettiyar.
38. " P. Subbarayan.
39. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi.
40. Mr. S. Muttumanikkachari.
41. Rev. W. Meston.
42. Mr. A. T. Palmer.
43. " M. Ratnaswami.
44. Sri Meka V. Apparao Bahadur.
45. The Zamindar of Mandasa.
46. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampar.
47. " C. R. T. Congreve.
48. A. D. M. Bayotti Sahib Bahadur.
49. Saiyid Muhammad Badsha Sahib Bahadur.
50. Muhammad Abdur-Rahim Khan Sahib.
51. Khan Sahib Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.
52. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib.
53. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib.
54. Mr. A. M. MacDougall.

The amendment was lost, 12 voting for and 54 against.

Clause 26 was then put and passed, and added to the Bill.

The Council adjourned at 5 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on Monday, the 5th February 1923.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

APPENDIX B.

[Vide page 1567 supra.]

Statement showing the commission drawn by the Official Assignee of Madras in each of the years 1918 to 1921, and the commission paid to Messrs. Dowden & Co., the auctioneers of the Official Assignee, during those years.

Year.	Commission					
	Drawn by the Official Assignee.			Paid to Dowden & Co.		
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
1918	21,101	6	10	13,799	10	2
1919	17,417	13	10	19,544	12	8
1920	52,963	7	10	5,278	4	9
1921	54,289	3	10	6,308	13	11

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO,
Secy. to Govt., Law Department.

2nd February 1923]

APPENDIX C.

[Vide page 1567 supra]

G.O. No. 63-A, Finance, dated 18th January 1923.

READ—the following papers :—

G.O. No. 400, Finance, dated 1st May 1922.

ABSTRACT.—Committees—Public Accounts and Finance—Constitution of —1922-23.

G.O. No. 762, Finance, dated 9th September 1922.

ABSTRACT.—Committee—Finance Committee—W. Alexander, Esq., nominated as a member.

Order—No. 63-A, Finance, dated 18th January 1923.

His Excellency the Governor is pleased to nominate Mr. C. E. Wood as a member of the Standing Finance Committee in place of Mr. W. Alexander resigned.

(By order of the Governor in Council)

E. S. LLOYD,
Secretary to Government.

To the Accountant-General.

Copy to the Secretaries to Departments of the Secretariat.

„ Secretary, Legislative Council (for communication to the
Members of the Legislative Council).

„ Publicity Officer.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

2nd February 1933]

Appendix C.

[Vide page 1237 ante.]

G.O. No. 23-A, Pinnares, dated 18th January 1933.

Read—the following papers:

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.

Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

G.O. No. 100, Pinnares, dated 1st May 1932.
Abstract—Committee—Pinnares—Accountant and Pinnares—Constitution of
—1932-33.

